

United Nations
**GENERAL
ASSEMBLY**

Official Records



PLENARY MEETING 563rd

Saturday, 3 November 1956,
at 8 p.m.

FIRST EMERGENCY SPECIAL SESSION

New York

CONTENTS

Agenda item 5:

Question considered by the Security Council at its 749th
and 750th meetings held on 30 October 1956 (*continued*) 45

Page

President: Mr. Rudecindo ORTEGA (Chile).

AGENDA ITEM 5

**Question considered by the Security Council at its
749th and 750th meetings, held on 30 Octo-
ber 1956 (*continued*)**

1. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*):
This meeting has been called by the Secretary-General
at my request in view of a communication from the
delegation of Egypt [A/3270].

2. Mr. LOUFI (Egypt) (*translated from French*):
Before discussing the substance of the matter I should
like to refer to the two draft resolutions presented today
by the representative of the United States of America
[A/3272, 3273]. I must confess that I hesitate to take
any decision here and now concerning these draft resolu-
tions since they have certain political implications
which compel me to consult my Government.

3. Following the armed attack by Israel upon Egypt
during the night of 30 October 1956, and the armed
attacks of the British-French forces, the General As-
sembly, at its 562nd meeting held during the night of
1 to 2 November, adopted a draft resolution submitted
by the United States delegation [A/3256], which be-
came resolution 997 (ES-I). The Egyptian delegation
voted for this resolution, although we should at this
stage have liked at least an explicit denunciation of the
attack and a statement that it was a violation of the
United Nations Charter and inconsistent with its pur-
poses and principles. An overwhelming majority of
delegations, however, had stated that they were in fa-
vour of this draft resolution and we wished to follow
the same course as the delegations supporting us in the
struggle which has been forced upon us.

4. Paragraph 5 of the resolution requests the Secre-
tary-General to observe and report promptly on the
compliance with this resolution to the Security Council
and to the General Assembly, for such further action
as they may deem appropriate in accordance with the
Charter. Paragraph 6 states that the General Assembly
decides to remain in emergency session pending com-
pliance with this resolution.

5. I received instructions from my Government yes-
terday, 2 November, to inform the Secretary-General
of the United Nations that the Egyptian Government
agreed to implement the resolution adopted by the As-
sembly on condition that the armed forces attacking
Egypt desisted from doing so; and to this end my
Government requested me, in a communication which
I have received from Cairo, to ask for a meeting of the

General Assembly today. Allow me to read you a few
passages from this communication, which has been dis-
tributed under the symbol A/3270. On the first page
we find the following passage:

"It was again clear that France and the United
Kingdom encouraged the Israel attack to take it as
a pretext to intervene in the area and to attack and
try to occupy Egyptian territory. The plot was made
clear by the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom
when he addressed an ultimatum to the Egyptian
Government asking for the cessation of hostilities
between Egypt and Israel, the withdrawal of military
forces ten miles from the Suez Canal and, further-
more, asking the agreement of the Egyptian Gov-
ernment for the occupation of Port Said, Ismailia and
Suez by French and British armed forces. The Brit-
ish ultimatum was calculated as not to be accepted
by any sovereign State. The Egyptian Government
used its right as a sovereign and independent State
and refused the ultimatum. In spite of the indignation
felt by world public opinion, the French and British
Governments put their ultimatum in effect.

"On the night of 31 October, joint French and
British forces began their attack on Egyptian people
and territory. They launched systematic and bar-
barous attacks by air on all Egyptian airfields, de-
stroying property and causing casualties among ci-
vilians without discrimination. So far casualties
amount to 250 victims."

The letter further states:

"In spite of this resolution, which represents the
deep conviction of the entire world, Anglo-French
air attacks continued and even increased in intensity
and frequency. Furthermore, it is also reported that
Anglo-French armed forces are taking part in the
fight against Egyptian troops on Egyptian territory
in the Sinai peninsula.

"Faced with this continuous ruthless Anglo-French
aggression, the Egyptian Government has decided to
ask for an immediate meeting of the General Assem-
bly in order to take the actions it pledged itself to
undertake in order to uphold the principles of law
and order and to stop the unprovoked attack to which
Egypt is unlawfully subjected and to put an end to
the deliberate massacre of peaceful civilians."

6. The Secretary-General's report [A/3267] states
that, as I have already announced, Egypt has agreed
to a cease-fire subject to a condition which I need not
repeat. France and the United Kingdom, on the other
hand, have sent the Secretary-General a negative reply,
as can be seen in particular in sub-paragraphs (b) and
(c) of paragraph 3 of his report, which read as
follows:

"(b) The United Nations decides to constitute and
maintain such a force until an Arab-Israel peace
settlement is reached and until satisfactory arrange-
ments have been agreed in regard to the Suez Canal,

both agreements to be guaranteed by the United Nations.

"(c) In the meantime, until the United Nations force is constituted, both combatants agree to accept forthwith limited detachments of Anglo-French troops to be stationed between the combatants."

7. Thus the United Kingdom has not changed its attitude. The United Kingdom and France continue to claim the right to maintain forces in Egypt on the false pretext of separating the Egyptian and Israel armies until a solution has been found to the Suez Canal question. The United Kingdom and France are still determined to act on their own initiative without any authorization from the United Nations.

8. What I say is borne out by the fact that British-French forces continue to bomb Egypt and, according to our information, have even tried to land on its territory. The cablegram sent to the Secretary-General by the representatives of the United Nations in Cairo, which has been distributed by the Secretary-General [A/3267, annex], also confirms my statement. The cablegram says, and I quote:

"... British radio has announced an imminent switch to communication centres, railway stations and telephone exchanges, many of which are located in densely populated areas. In spite of warning to civilian population to keep clear of these areas, implementation of this policy will result in a terrific loss of life. We urge you to use every means available to you to restrain implementation of this policy".

Thus the brutal intentions and bad faith of the aggressors remain clear.

9. Similarly Israel, continuing its armed attack, has occupied the town of Gaza in violation of the armistice conventions and the United Nations Charter.

10. It is clear from what I have said, and above all from the events which have occurred since the resolution was adopted, that General Assembly resolution 997 (ES-I) has not been implemented and has not stopped the armed attacks against Egypt.

11. This bloody, brutal, premeditated armed attack has aroused general indignation among world public opinion. Even in the United Kingdom, the Opposition is making more and more strenuous efforts to persuade Sir Anthony Eden to modify his attitude. Even the Archbishop of Canterbury has denounced this use of force.

"We cannot ignore the fact", he said, "that the President of the United States thinks we have made a grave error, that world opinion on the whole is convinced we have made a grave error... The situation has produced a total political cleavage in this country... Christian opinion is terribly uneasy and unhappy. The point to which the Christian conscience must most acutely address itself is whether or not we are standing for the spirit of the United Nations Charter."

Mr. Nutting, British Minister of State, is reported to have resigned to mark his disapproval of his Government's action.

12. Egypt is encouraged in its fight against aggression by the evidence of sympathy and denunciations of aggression which have come from all over the world.

13. In the face of the behaviour of Israel, France and the United Kingdom and their refusal to implement the Assembly resolution, which Egypt has accepted, it is

for the Assembly to take further steps to stop aggression, arrest the bloodshed and re-establish peace, humanity's greatest blessing.

14. Egypt, a peaceful country subjected to brutal armed attack, in violation of the United Nations Charter, by two great countries, permanent members of the Security Council, is defending itself and will continue to do so.

15. I shall not take up the arguments adduced by the United Kingdom and French delegations to justify this attack. All my colleagues have answered them, and I could not do better.

16. The situation is deteriorating; the war may flare up more violently at any moment. The peoples of the world have placed their hopes in the United Nations. Do not disappoint them.

17. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before I call upon the next speaker on the list, the Secretary-General would like to report to the General Assembly.

18. The SECRETARY-GENERAL: I have just received information which I think I should bring to the attention of the General Assembly. I could, of course, have waited to circulate it in the normal way, but I believe that this is information of which the members of the Assembly would like to be seized.

19. It is a letter from the permanent representative of the United Kingdom¹ in which, on instructions from his Government, he refers to the communication from the representative of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization in Cairo which is annexed to my report that is before the Assembly [A/3267]. The statement he encloses is a statement from the Minister of Defence in London, issued at 11.45 p.m. today. It reads as follows:

"Reports have been circulated that Anglo-French forces now intend to attack centres of communication, including telephone exchanges and railway stations, where heavy civilian casualties would be inevitable. This is quite untrue. Anglo-French attacks are now being switched from air to army targets, and no such attacks are to be made where civilian casualties would be inevitable."

20. This document will, of course, be immediately circulated to members of the Assembly.

21. Mr. LODGE (United States of America): The position of the United States was made abundantly clear in the resolution adopted by the General Assembly the other night [997 (ES-I)], and so there is no need for me to repeat it now. The United States deeply regrets the fact that that resolution, which represented the views of such an overwhelming majority of the United Nations, has not yet brought about a cessation of hostilities. The United States earnestly hopes that all parties in the conflict will be guided by the conclusive evidence of world opinion which the very large vote the other night symbolized.

22. The United States is firmly convinced that the problems which gave rise to the present situation can and must be solved by peaceful and just means. A solution on any other basis would, at best, provide only a temporary respite: at worst, it would in all likelihood sow the seeds of even graver problems in the future. That is why the United States believes that, while we should continue our efforts to obtain quick compliance with the General Assembly's cease-fire reso-

¹ Subsequently reproduced as document A/3274.

lution, we must not lose sight of the problems and conditions which gave rise to the present situation.

23. As Secretary of State Dulles stated at the 561st meeting, the present situation has resulted from a long and sad history of irritations and provocations. The instability of the armistice agreements is too well known to require comment. They have been violated repeatedly by Israel and by its Arab neighbours. The armistice, which should have led to a peaceful settlement, has instead given rise to growing provocation and increasing tension, especially since the ominous rearmament of Egypt by the Soviet Union. The abrupt seizure by Egypt of the Universal Suez Canal Company, and the failure thus far of efforts to find a solution to this important problem, have created a situation of deep concern to many nations.

24. While the temptation is strong to place the whole blame on the States directly concerned, the fact is, as Secretary Dulles reminded us, that the United Nations must also share responsibility for what has happened. It is clear that we, the Members of the United Nations, have not done all that should have been done to bring about the settlement of these matters in accordance with the principles of justice and international law. That is why the United States today announced that it would introduce two draft resolutions dealing with the substance of the problems which gave rise to the present critical situation in the Middle East. These proposals are now before the General Assembly. With these draft resolutions we hope that we may begin now to lay the foundation for the constructive action which must follow the cessation of hostilities, and I should like to describe these two draft resolutions to the General Assembly.

25. The first draft resolution [A/3272] proposes a new approach to the settlement of the major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in that part of the world. We all know the history of the long, conscientious but painful efforts which have been made by the General Assembly, the Security Council and the subsidiary bodies. In the last few years the majority of the deliberations of the Security Council have been devoted to the Palestine question, and each session of the General Assembly has found us engaged in deliberations which we hoped might lead, however slowly, to better relations in the area. But the fact that we have hostilities there today indicates that those efforts have failed. For this reason we must frankly look now to some new means which, given the support of this body and the co-operation of the parties concerned, may at last achieve a final and a just peace in this part of the world.

26. The agency of this Assembly which has, since 1948, been charged with the responsibility of working out arrangements for a final solution of the problems outstanding between Israel and the Arab States is the Palestine Conciliation Commission. The United States was a member of that Commission, and, together with the other two members, strove to fulfill its assignment. During the eight years of its existence the Commission has achieved some few things. It has clarified a number of issues between the Arab States and Israel which stood in the way of a settlement. It has achieved the unconditional release of Arab accounts blocked in Israel. The Commission has also done a tremendous amount of slow and exact work in attempting to estimate and evaluate the amount of compensation due on Arab

property left in Israel by those who are now Arab refugees. But despite this work, in paragraph 2 of its fifteenth progress report [A/3199] dated 4 October of this year, the Commission stated:

"The Commission . . . must report again this year that, in view of the unchanged attitudes of the parties and their failure to avail themselves of the Commission's services, the Commission has had no opportunity to exercise its general function of conciliation with any prospect of success".

27. This, in the United States Government's view, must be the final chapter of the Conciliation Commission's efforts. We must try something new—something free of the technical and procedural problems which confronted the Commission—if we are to have any justifiable hope of progress towards a settlement of the major problems outstanding between the Arab States and Israel. We can say this because the United States is a member of the Commission. The Commission has failed, and, while we will keep what it has achieved or is achieving, we must try something new.

28. For this reason the United States is suggesting in its draft resolution the establishment of a new committee to be composed of five Members of this General Assembly who will prepare recommendations, after consultation with the parties to the General Armistice Agreements, regarding the settlement of the major problems outstanding between them with a view to establishing conditions of permanent peace and stability in that part of the world. We propose that that committee should submit its recommendations to the parties concerned and to the General Assembly. If necessary, or as appropriate, these proposals might be submitted to the Security Council. The purpose of this is to ensure that the parties themselves, the General Assembly, or, if necessary, the Security Council may have an opportunity to accept and act upon them. Alternatively, through the responses which the parties may make, the committee may continue to seek a settlement satisfactory and just to all, and thus solve this critical problem once and for all.

29. Two other matters are important in this connexion, and our draft resolution therefore addresses itself to them.

30. We think that there have been no more selfless and devoted international servants of justice and peace than the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, as they have sought to enforce the General Armistice Agreements and to act as the agents of the Security Council. It is not for this body to give them further suggestions or guidance. It is, however, for this body to commend them for what they have done and for the diligence and the courage which they have shown in the face of many trying obstacles, and to urge that the parties directly concerned should co-operate fully with them as they carry out their presently imposed future tasks. I refer, of course, to General Burns and the staff working under him.

31. The second matter which warrants our concern is the plight of the Arab refugees. In the name of humanity, it is important that through these critical and battle-torn days those most directly concerned should be certain that the Arab refugees are cared for and safe. We make a recommendation to that end, and recommend further that all Members of the United Nations consider and furnish the additional assistance to those refugees that may be necessary.

32. That concludes my observations on the first draft resolution submitted by the United States delegation.

33. I shall now address myself to the second draft resolution [A/3273]. This draft resolution offers a means of finding a solution to the Suez Canal question. The Security Council has already made certain recommendations which could form the basis for a settlement. Recent events, however, have linked this question with the hostilities now being waged in that part of the world. The Security Council's resolution of 13 October [S/3675] emerged after many weeks of study of the Suez question and represented the efforts of many nations and many people. It sets forth the six basic principles which, it is believed, are necessary for a settlement of the Suez Canal question. We attach great importance to these principles. That is why the United States draft resolution endorses the 13 October resolution in its entirety.

34. The United States draft resolution then refers to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November, which, *inter alia*, took note of the interruption of traffic in the Canal to the serious prejudice of many nations, and urged that steps should be taken to reopen the Canal and restore freedom of navigation, upon the conclusion of a cease-fire.

35. Recognizing that the permanent solution to the situation must be consistent with the principles of justice and international law, the sovereignty of Egypt and the rights of the users of the Canal, as guaranteed by the Convention of 1888,² the draft resolution would establish a committee composed of three Powers to assume the responsibility for, first, taking whatever measures were necessary for the immediate reopening of the Canal as a secure international waterway; secondly, drawing up a plan, in consultation with the three nations most directly involved in the present problem, for the purpose of operating and maintaining the Canal and freedom of passage through it, in accordance with the Convention of 1888 and the six requirements adopted by the Security Council on 13 October; and thirdly, adopting and putting this plan into effect.

36. Finally, the draft resolution requests the committee to report to the General Assembly and the Security Council, as appropriate; invites the committee to make recommendations for a just and permanent settlement of the Suez problem, consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; and requests the Members of the United Nations to give the committee all appropriate assistance.

37. I urge the General Assembly to seize this opportunity to make a start toward a solution of two of the gravest issues threatening world peace. The time to act is now, while the awful consequences of previous failures and delays are so clear. Let us stop the futile process of patching up previous agreements and understandings, which but serves to provide new pretexts for further provocations. Let us face up to our responsibilities under the Charter. Let us work together for a lasting settlement of what has become a dangerous threat to the peace of the world.

38. Mr. JAWAD (Iraq): This is no time for either oratory or the expression of emotions. The situation is so grave that every minute must be measured by the extensive military destruction and the slaughter of innocent human beings. It is the paramount duty of this Assembly to arrest the aggressors, while there is still

time, and to save the peace, the world in general, and the Middle East in particular. Furthermore, it is the duty of this Assembly to assert its authority, since only through such action can it save the only existing international machinery which is in a position to operate. If it fails to do so, the tragic responsibility will fall on every one of us, and thus we shall have led the world back to the dark ages.

39. Everyone here and elsewhere is aware of the dangers involved in the refusal of the three aggressive Powers to abide by the decision adopted by this Assembly on 2 November. That decision, which was adopted by a majority of sixty-four votes, shows beyond any doubt that world public opinion was shocked by the premeditated acts of aggression against a small country—the more so when it was realized that two permanent members of the Security Council were responsible for engineering the conspiracy. The fact that, so far, a cease-fire has not been achieved in compliance with the resolution is a clear indication that the Powers in question have no respect either for the authority of the United Nations or for the law of nations. For these Powers—and here I refer particularly to the United Kingdom and France—there seems to exist no other binding factor than that of force. They have taken the law into their own hands, despite the advice and warning of large and small Powers. This is the law of the jungle, and the Powers in question are persistently applying that law by means of their land, sea and air forces.

40. What makes the position even worse is the insistence of these Powers on implementing a policy which has been condemned by this Assembly and world public opinion—and this includes public opinion in their own countries. What worse dictatorship can the world expect to find? When the Nazis and the Fascists plunge the world into a total war of murder and destruction they defied the entire world, just as these Members of the United Nations are now doing. But the Nazis and the Fascists had never recognized the authority of the League of Nations, had never accepted the binding moral force of the law of nations. They never spoke of democracy; they despised it. And they stood alone in their defiance of the entire civilized world. Where do the Powers of whom I am now speaking stand in comparison with the Nazis and the Fascists?

41. It would be neither fair nor just to accuse all—I repeat: all—the British and French people of fascism. These two great peoples have carried the torch of civilization and democracy for centuries. The unfortunate fact, however, is that those in power have been motivated by imperialist policies—and imperialism is its decadent and rapidly declining stages. It is this decline which they strive to avert, but this is not in conformity with the historical laws of human progress. In fact, they want to put the clock back, as the Nazis tried to do at great expense. We are sure that the will of the peoples in the United Kingdom and France ultimately will bring to reason the imperialist ruling circles in those two countries. It is no longer a secret that the vested interests are in flagrant contradiction with the primary premises of international civilized existence. The last fifty years have witnessed the great awakening of peoples in under-developed parts of the world, a historical necessity that can never be averted. Imperialist policies refuse to recognize this human evolution. On the contrary, policies in the imperialistic countries have always been directed to stopping this evolution at any price. Unfortunately, this price has been paid by

² Convention respecting the free navigation of the Suez Maritime Canal, signed at Constantinople on 29 October 1888.

innocent people in those countries, and it is a price that is too high in terms of human life and progress; but, sooner or later, colonialism will pay its own price too.

42. With such a background, it is easy to realize that imperialism does not abide by international or moral considerations and decisions unless they suit its own purpose, and its own purpose is to plunge the world into a blood bath for profit or domination. Is there any proof needed other than the non-compliance of the United Kingdom and France with the resolution adopted by this Assembly? While those countries are still bombing towns and peoples in Egypt, they do not hide their real intentions. That is why they have suggested the constitution of a United Nations armed force, while their detachments occupy the territories of the victims of aggression. The conspiracy against Egypt and against peace is quite obvious. What is more obvious than the fact that the aggressors will not stop their acts of war unless their policy of war is carried to a conclusion?

43. The calling of this special session was the outcome of the abuse of the use of the veto in the Security Council. General Assembly resolution 377 (V), entitled "Uniting for peace", which was adopted in 1950, has provided a way of avoiding the misuse of the veto in the Security Council and enabled collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace to be undertaken. It calls, therefore, upon this Assembly to take in hand whatever powers the Charter has provided for such circumstances. It is time for this Assembly to consider the measures to be taken to remove the threat to the peace and the breach of the peace—I refer in particular to Chapter VII of the Charter—with the object of applying such sanctions as may be appropriate to meet the requirements of the situation.

44. Any other procedure would be an endeavour to divert the attention of this Assembly from the real problem. A diversion to other problems would be nothing but utter defeatism. When one cannot make an aggressor abide by the rule of law, then one accepts his interpretation of the law and his method of implementation. What more can an aggressor ask than to commit aggression and persist in carrying it out despite the decisions of a world assembly? The first draft resolution submitted this evening provides ample evidence to this effect. It ignores, or rather scraps, all that the United Nations has done and endeavoured to do in the past with regard to Palestine. That is because the aggressor persists in defying the decision of this Assembly in that part of the world. It is rather surprising that instead of recognizing the rights of the people of Palestine, it suggests, and then only *en passant*, that they should be treated in a humane way.

45. While we had hoped that the Members of this Organization would take a stand against the defiance by the aggressors of decisions of this Assembly, we find that all the elements of appeasement have been put together in the two draft resolutions before us. Appeasement has never been a successful policy; it has often led to disaster. If we gave way to the spirit of appeasement, aggression would become the policy of all; at such a moment, alas, there remains no *raison d'être* for this Organization.

46. Mr. SCHURMANN (Netherlands): The present dangerous situation in the Middle East is one which demands of the Members of the United Nations that they should act not in hot blood, but with calm, dignity, and, if possible, wisdom. That situation has come about as a result of the continuous and increasing threats of

the surrounding nations against the peace and territorial integrity and, even, against the very existence of Israel. It has been aggravated by the rash and indefensible action of Egypt in nationalizing the Universal Suez Canal Company and by the Soviet shipments of arms to that country. Finally, it has persisted through the inability of the United Nations as a whole to intervene and to restore peace and order in that area.

47. It is, therefore, nugatory to try to assess or to apportion the blame for the difficulties that confront us, because all of us, all Members of the United Nations, have to take some share in that blame. It would be particularly unjust to single out either Israel or France and the United Kingdom and to reproach the one for having taken the action which it considered necessary for its self-defence and survival and the others for having stepped in where the United Nations had failed to act.

48. What is necessary is that we should find some means of reasserting the jurisdiction of the United Nations over matters which plainly fall within its responsibility, and that we should do so in a manner that provides not only for an immediate cease-fire without a real settlement, for that would only perpetuate the chaos, but also for a just and equitable solution of the two main problems involved. Such a solution of the dispute between Israel and its neighbouring States and of the question of Suez Canal should not be merely a temporary expedient, but one that would give promise of some permanence.

49. In the view of the Netherlands Government, the proposals contained in the reply made by the representative of the United Kingdom to the inquiry of the Secretary-General, which are set forth in document A/3267, form the best possible step towards such a solution. These proposals, as I may remind my fellow representatives, are to the effect that, *inter alia*, both the Egyptian and the Israel Governments should agree to accept a United Nations force to keep the peace; and the United Nations should decide to constitute and to maintain such a force until an Arab-Israel peace settlement is reached and until satisfactory arrangements in regard to the Suez Canal have been agreed upon, both agreements to be guaranteed by the United Nations.

50. During the debate on 1 and 2 November [561st and 562nd meetings] both the United Kingdom and the French representatives stated emphatically that their Governments had no desire whatever that the military action which they had taken should be more than temporary in its duration. The proposals which they have now made prove that these Governments were sincere in these statements and that they are prepared to act in accordance with them. If these proposals are accepted by Israel and Egypt and if the United Nations force for which they call is formed and dispatched to the area, then the British-French intervention will cease, the United Nations will take charge of a situation where it is its plain duty to exercise its authority and the basis will have been laid for a settlement of the two questions which have for so long disturbed the peace.

51. As to the settlement of the Suez Canal question, the Netherlands Government remains convinced that that could be and should be governed by the six principles on which agreement was reached when the Security Council dealt with this matter [S/3675]; and that the proposals of the eighteen Powers [S/3665], in which these principles were embodied, provide a just basis for negotiation. One of these principles to which my Government

attaches great importance is that Egyptian sovereignty should be respected.

52. With regard to the draft resolutions which have been presented, in common, I think, with most of my fellow representatives, I have not yet had the time to secure instructions from my Government. I should therefore like to reserve the right to speak on these two draft resolutions separately later on.

53. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): When I received the notification this afternoon from the Secretary-General of the resumption of this emergency special session of the General Assembly at eight o'clock this evening I must confess that I did not know what would be discussed. However, since the adoption of the resolution by the General Assembly on the morning of 2 November calling for a cease-fire by the parties engaged in the conflict, I have watched the developments with almost breathless interest, and so far there has not seemed to be the slightest indication of compliance with that resolution.

54. In considering the nature of the action that this Assembly can take in the circumstances, it might perhaps be worthwhile to consider by what authority this emergency special session was called by the Security Council and, also, the immediate motivation for the resumption of the session this evening. It will be noted that this emergency special session was called to examine the question which had been considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings, held on 30 October 1956. If I recall correctly, what was considered at the 749th meeting of the Security Council was the United States draft resolution [S/3710], which was presented a few hours after the reported penetration of Egyptian territory by Israel forces. That draft resolution was designed to call for an immediate cease-fire and the withdrawal of the forces to the demarcation lines, and it asked the Member States to refrain from doing anything that might result in a breach of the peace. The draft resolution was vetoed by the United Kingdom and France at that meeting of the Security Council.

55. At the 750th meeting, if I also remember correctly, the subject that was dealt with was the letter from Egypt [S/3712] in connexion with the ultimatum which had been received by that Government from the Governments of France and the United Kingdom. It is therefore obvious that when the General Assembly met the day following those meetings, the question to be considered was the immediate hostilities, the actual breach of the peace. Or, as far as the legal relevancy of the issues is concerned, this emergency special session of the General Assembly was called to consider the military act of penetration of Egypt by Israel forces and the ultimatum that was issued by the United Kingdom and France. It was with a view to considering this breach of the peace that we adopted on 2 November the resolution in which we asked for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of the forces of the combatants from the area of hostilities, and for all Members to refrain from introducing military goods, and to halt military movements, into the area.

56. This evening we are asked to consider two draft resolutions presented by the United States delegation. Before commenting on these resolutions, I must reiterate emphatically the consistent position of my Government as far as this crisis is concerned, which is that its fundamental and primary aim is to help to seek the restoration of peace. Wherever possible, in order to avoid any aggravation of the situation, we will not

express our views on who is right and who is wrong in the controversy. We feel this is not the proper time to do so. Any attempt on our part, as I announced in my first intervention, to point to any particular combatant as being in the wrong now would only aggravate matters.

57. The first United States draft resolution, contained in document A/3272, seeks to deal with the Palestine question. It proposes in its operative paragraphs to secure "a just and lasting peace" by removing the underlying causes of tension in the area with a view to achieving a final settlement between the parties to the General Armistice Agreements. The reference is to Egypt and to Israel. The second draft resolution [A/3273] seeks to consider the Suez Canal question, also with a view to seeking a final and conclusive solution of the outstanding issues between the parties. At the outset I must say that I will not be in a position to express my views on the merits of these two proposals for lack of specific instructions from my Government. I shall only comment on these two draft resolutions as far as the practical and procedural aspects are concerned.

58. From a procedural point of view I have serious misgivings on these two proposals. First, with respect to the Suez Canal question, it will be remembered that the Security Council is actually seized of this issue. Egypt, the United Kingdom and France have agreed on six principles, and on the basis of those six principles they were in the process of continuing negotiations when the hostilities broke out. But the outbreak of hostilities did not remove this question from the Security Council, in which the issue is still pending. It is quite obvious from the relevant provisions of the Charter that the General Assembly cannot consider a question of which the Security Council is actually seized. That is rather elementary.

59. It may be argued, of course, that this emergency session was called in pursuance of General Assembly resolution 377 A (V). But the main basis of that resolution lies in paragraph 1 of part A, which I shall read in part:

"... that if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or active aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security".

60. It is thus obvious that resolution 377 A (V), which was the enabling authority for the calling of this emergency session, provides as a basis an actual breach of the peace, and that the General Assembly has to meet whenever it appears that the Security Council for lack of unanimity, fails to exercise and discharge its responsibility to maintain international peace and security.

61. Did the question of the Suez Canal, when it was first raised in the Security Council, present an aspect such as would make it fall within the purview of General Assembly resolution 377 A (V)? Undoubtedly it did not. And as the Security Council was actually seized of this issue, and there was no change in that status, as well as in the progress, of the negotiation

between the parties in the Security Council, I cannot understand how we can now competently consider the Suez Canal question with a view to the ultimate and final liquidation of its basic issues. Therefore, as far as the procedural aspect of this United States draft resolution is concerned, I have serious misgivings as to whether we can act on it at all.

62. Off hand I can say that I view with great sympathy the noble motivation of this draft resolution. No one can fail to share with the United States delegation the motive which lies behind its aims to liquidate a question that may be a source of continuing friction between the Egyptian Government and the French and United Kingdom Governments, a question that plagued the parties even before the outbreak of hostilities. But to the extent that the United States draft resolution seeks a final and conclusive settlement of the question, in the context of the actual hostilities now in progress, I doubt whether this special session of the General Assembly could validly deal with it.

63. These remarks apply with equal force to the other resolution of the United States delegation. This resolution refers to the Palestine question and, as I have stated, it also seeks to achieve a final settlement of the question. To achieve that end it seeks to create a committee of five which will first prepare recommendations with regard to the settlement of the major problems between the Arab States and Israel and then submit these recommendations to the parties concerned, to the General Assembly and to the Security Council. It will be remembered that the Palestine question presents many profound problems of outstanding character. Foremost among these is the question, for example, of the repatriation or resettlement of the refugees, which for many years has defied solution by our body. There are many intricate problems involved in the Palestine question which year after year it has been the task of the United Nations to consider. As I said, as this session was convoked only to meet the emergency arising from the hostilities as a result of the penetration of Egyptian territory by Israel forces and the military action of France and the United Kingdom, the proposal that it should consider the long-standing Palestine problem with a view to its ultimate and final settlement is open to serious question.

64. I wish to express again my deep sympathy for this draft resolution and for the noble motivation behind it. Perhaps at an appropriate time in the future we might favour its consideration. I believe, however, that this emergency session of the General Assembly should confine itself to the issues as they are now, the issues which were faced at the meeting on 2 November.

65. The General Assembly has already adopted a cease-fire resolution and should immediately concern itself with the question whether the parties to the conflict are disposed to comply with it. On the basis of the report by the Secretary-General [A/3267], who was requested in the resolution so to report, that the resolution has not been complied with, this emergency session should then consider how the resolution should be enforced or whether or not it could be implemented. That, in my view, should be the purpose of our meeting. To consider the United States draft resolutions now, without making any reference to the cease-fire resolution which this Assembly has adopted would be to create the impression throughout the world that we are evading the General Assembly resolution. The psychological impact of such an impression would be enormous. Nothing would contribute more to lowering

the prestige of this Organization than an apparent aversion to meeting the situation squarely.

66. Therefore, in co-operation with other delegations, we might submit within a few hours a draft resolution of our own which would fundamentally reaffirm the General Assembly resolution of 2 November. After eighteen or twenty-four hours—or whatever period of time we might agree upon—we might request the Secretary-General to report on the status of compliance or non-compliance with that resolution.

67. Allow me to summarize my views briefly. The Philippine delegation cannot now comment on the intrinsic merits of the United States draft resolutions as we have not as yet received our instructions. However, I commend those drafts for the noble motivation behind them and, in all likelihood, I may recommend to my Government that they be sympathetically considered at an appropriate time in the future. Procedurally, however, I entertain serious doubts as to whether this emergency session could consider the two draft resolutions. As they make no mention of the previous resolution of this emergency special session, I fear that they might be interpreted by the world as an act of evasion, to the great detriment to the prestige of this body.

68. Mr. ASHA (Syria): As I speak from this rostrum in addressing this august Assembly, British and French armed forces are setting upon Egypt, the victim of their aggression, with the furious frenzy of a monster unchained. It is highly significant that the United Kingdom Government submits war bulletins to the United Nations instead of informing it that it has complied with the request of this Assembly to cease fire and stop the aggression.

69. Despite the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November, despite the condemnation of the combined British-French-Israel aggression by an overwhelming majority of the Member States of the United Nations, despite the formal order for an immediate cease-fire addressed to these three aggressors, despite acceptance by Egypt, the victim of the aggression, of the order to cease fire in compliance with the resolution of the General Assembly—despite all this, the United Kingdom, France and Israel continue to subject Egypt to armed attack, without respite and without discrimination between military and civilian targets, in contempt of the United Nations and of all humanity.

70. The United Nations is witnessing the almost unbelievable spectacle of two of its most important Members lined up with Israel in deliberate and open subversion of it, in a move to undermine the very foundations of morality and peace in the world. Unashamedly the accomplices confront the General Assembly, as they confronted the Security Council, with defiance and obstinacy.

71. This combined armed attack is continuing and intensifying, and is bringing in its train an irreparable loss in human lives and material destruction of vast encompassment. It threatens to degenerate into a general conflagration, not only within the region of the Middle East but throughout the entire world, in the wake of those repercussions which will inevitably be produced. According to a message received from Cairo by the United Nations today, and annexed to the report of the Secretary-General [A/3267], the British radio announced:

“... an imminent switch to include communication centres, railway stations and telephone exchanges,

many of which are located in densely populated areas. In spite of warning to civilian population to keep clear of these areas, implementation of this policy will result in a terrific loss of life. We urge you to use every means available to you to restrain implementation of this policy”.

72. It is indeed a mockery, it is an insult, to be told by the United Kingdom and France that military operations in Egypt will be completed in one or two days and that the landing of their aggressive forces will mean Egypt's surrender. I feel assured that such claims are not accepted even for home consumption. The truth is that Egypt and the Egyptian army are strong, and will continue to be strong. The Egyptian army has not been destroyed, as the three aggressors claim. I know that the representatives of these three aggressors themselves do not believe that. Every Egyptian man, woman and child will fight the aggressors, not for one day, not for one week, not for one month, but for a year, perhaps for many years.

73. And Egypt is not alone. All the Arabs will take up their arms in defence of Egypt and of their own countries. Already a number of Arab Governments have taken action. There will be more news bulletins to read against the aggressors. Every Arab citizen is ready to sacrifice his or her life, to repel this uncivilized, savage triple aggression. This Arab participation, as legitimate and collective defence, becomes every day more inevitable in the face of the tripartite aggression which threatens to destroy the very foundations of the Arab world.

74. But this is far more than a conflict between Egypt and the three States which have attacked it. It is far more than an issue between the Arab States in general and those which have attacked one of their number. The issue is whether there is to be a double standard of morality in the world—one for the larger and one for the smaller States—or, to put it another way, whether hypocrisy is to become the way of international life. It is, to put it bluntly, the issue of the worth, the effectiveness, of the United Nations, and the confidence which peoples all over the world may have in it. If there is to remain any hope for peaceful existence in the world, we in this Assembly must make it clear beyond all doubt that an aggression is no less of an aggression, no less of an international crime, no less an object of international condemnation, because some, claiming to be great Powers, indulge in it.

75. The General Assembly is summoned anew today to decide upon the measures that must be taken immediately, in conformity with the United Nations Charter, to deal with the defiance cast at it by the United Kingdom, France and Israel. The General Assembly is bound, as much by the provisions of the Charter as by those of the relevant resolutions: 377 (V), entitled “Uniting for peace”; 378 (V), regarding the duties of States in the event of the outbreak of hostilities; and 380 (V), relative to peace through deeds. The General Assembly is bound to discharge its responsibilities in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and with those resolutions. It cannot divest itself of these responsibilities without dealing a mortal blow to the United Nations and to the peace of the world.

76. France, the United Kingdom and their stooge, Israel, have attempted, both before the Security Council and before this Assembly, to confuse the basic issue on which we are meeting tonight, namely, their aggression, by referring to the so-called provocations by Egypt and the other Arab countries. Mr. Eban ap-

peared to be on the verge of shedding crocodile tears for that tiny little State which, according to him, has been harassed for eight years by its neighbours.

77. I do not intend to take the time of this Assembly to reply to a monologue replete with lies and distortion of facts such as has been inflicted on our ears for many years by the representative of Israel. In fact, he stood unabashedly before this august body the other day to repeat a song which he had already sung, word for word, a day earlier—and which he has done again lately—before the Security Council.

78. One cannot remain silent at the sudden change of face by the United Kingdom and France. Is it not astounding that the very countries which have condemned Israel on several occasions in the Security Council, and which have always associated their Governments with the reports of the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Commission—which invariably put the greatest blame on Israel's provocative attitude for the deterioration of the situation on the armistice lines—should now abjure their word and sell their conscience to the expediency of the moment and, in order to attain their selfish interests, turn to accuse the victim of aggression of having committed acts of provocation to justify their aggression? Those who seem to have the audacity to defy the whole world, which condemned their aggression, should at least have shown the courage to stand by their previous position like lions, rather than debase themselves by manoeuvring like foxes turning to their prey.

79. I do not wish to answer now the malicious accusations of these aggressors. The facts are already in the archives of the United Nations.

80. Let us now examine the conditions under which the United Kingdom and French Governments “would most willingly stop military action” [A/3268, 3269].

81. Among the conditions imposed by the French and United Kingdom Governments for the cessation of military action, undertaken by them in flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, figures the unimaginable, the unbelievable condition of the stationing of French and British troops to separate the combatants. The stationing of such troops between the combatants can only signify the stationing of these troops on Egyptian territory. Such an occupation, if it came about—which is an incredible and inadmissible hypothesis—and if it were tolerated, would be a serious violation of the natural right of legitimate defence which Egypt is called upon to use by virtue of Article 51 of the Charter. Now, according to this same Article, no provision of the Charter may violate the natural right of legitimate defence, individual or collective, when a Member of the United Nations is the object of an armed aggression. The exercise by Egypt of this natural and sacred right of legitimate defence has been rendered necessary and inevitable by the aggression perpetrated against it by France, the United Kingdom and Israel. The exercise of this right has precedence, according to Article 51 of the Charter, and in the initial phase of the aggression still in progress, over any measures that the Security Council would be called upon to take in conformity with this Article of the Charter in order to maintain international peace and security.

82. To tolerate the stationing of French and British troops on Egyptian territory would be to permit the stationing of an aggressor on the territory of his victim, when what the victim needs is precisely the aid of the United Nations in order to face the aggression and to

make use of his natural right of legitimate defence in order to repulse the aggressor. The inadmissible course of tolerating the stationing of French and British troops would be, purely and simply, the acceptance of a *fait accompli*, a status brought about by the aggression. Toleration of such occupation would go even further than the aggression itself, for it would reduce to nullity the right of legitimate defence consecrated by the right of self-preservation of States in the Charter. It would be in the highest degree immoral, unjust, and in contradiction of the provisions of the Charter and of international law.

83. Furthermore, the United Kingdom and France cannot pretend to set themselves up as policemen acting on behalf of the United Nations, at the same time that they themselves have opposed every action that the Security Council attempted to take in order to put an end to the hostilities, and at a time when sixty-four Member States of the United Nations out of a total of sixty-nine countries—five of which are aggressors or accomplices of aggressors—have openly and publicly and vehemently condemned the infamous and cowardly aggression perpetrated by the two Powers with the complicity of Israel.

84. In these agonizing circumstances, what is the General Assembly to do? Its resolution has clearly been rejected by the aggressors, and today we assemble either to bury this great edifice of peace or to pull it out of the abyss dug by the aggressors to be its grave. I trust that Members will spare no effort and spare no sacrifice to save the United Nations from the fate of its predecessor, the League of Nations.

85. Is it not the irony of fate that Mr. Eden, who raised his voice high to condemn Mussolini's aggression on Ethiopia and who then asked the world to honour the Covenant of the League of Nations by meeting the aggression with appropriate sanctions, stands today as the master of a more serious aggression, the horrible consequences of which are hard to calculate? Tonight it is our duty to hearken to the voice of Mr. Eden in 1936 in order to atone for his crime on 31 October 1956.

86. The new situation which the General Assembly is called upon to meet, under its responsibilities for the maintenance of peace and security in the world, compels us to adopt new measures. Actually, the measures prescribed by the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November, which constitute provisional measures in accordance with Article 40 of the Charter, have not been implemented by France, the United Kingdom and Israel. By virtue of the same Article, the General Assembly is bound to take due account of this failure. The General Assembly must, in accordance with paragraph 5 of the resolution already adopted, take new measures to enforce its decisions.

87. These new measures are embodied in Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter. They may include complete or partial interruption of economic relations of rail, sea, air, postal, telegraphic, radio and other means of communication, and the severance of diplomatic relations. Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. Such action may include demonstrations, blockades and other operations by air, sea or land forces of Members of the United Nations.

88. The responsibility of Member States to impose such measures is stressed in the Charter and the previously mentioned resolution of the General Assembly. It would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Charter to have the Assembly discuss any measures other than those embodied in its last resolution, or deal with measures which do not aim at enforcing the resolution already voted upon by an overwhelming majority of this Assembly. This resolution requests the immediate cessation of the tripartite military action of the United Kingdom, France and Israel. The Assembly may at this stage, in so far as the cease-fire order has not been carried out by the aggressors, only impose new measures provided for in the Charter, namely, sanctions to enforce the preliminary measures mentioned.

89. As to the two draft resolutions submitted this evening by the representative of the United States, we feel that at this stage, pending instructions from our Government, we are unable to express any views.

90. Mr. LALL (India): Less than forty-eight hours ago in this very hall we adopted a resolution which was moderate in tone, which was restrained, which was constructive, and which attempted not to worsen the situation in any way but to do something to arrest the damage to human life and property and the repercussions of that damage which were then beginning. It is a matter of the gravest disappointment to us that that resolution, moderate though it was, statesmanlike though it was, and though it was introduced by the leading Western Power, has not been complied with by the Western Powers concerned. This is a matter of gravest concern because the result of non-compliance has led to a steady worsening of the situation.

91. Fighting has intensified. We note that there has been a cablegram from the United Nations representatives in Cairo informing us of the intensification of attacks [A/3267, annex]. We also note that the representative of the United Kingdom has published a contradiction [A/3274] of this particular report, but the statement he has given us in itself indicates that there has been an intensification of the fighting. It does not give my delegation much comfort to be told that there has been a switch from air to army targets. After all, are army targets always isolated from places of civilian habitation; and, after all, are not army persons only human beings in uniform? Is not human life concerned in this case also? We do not see that this contradiction brushes aside the main fact, which is that the situation is worse than it was two days ago, that there is an intensification of the evils which confronted us when we met here two days ago.

92. Furthermore, we are now faced definitely with just those events which we were told were the reason why certain Western Powers had embarked on their expedition in Egypt. The very situations have arisen which the Western Powers sought to avert by going into this operation in Egypt. I refer to the closing of the Canal and to the cutting of oil pipelines. This was just the sort of thing that we were told the Western Powers wished to avert, and here, as a result of their operations, just those things are taking place.

93. Though all this is happening, and though the picture is growing darker, at the same time I think it is also our duty to bring to the notice of this Assembly that efforts are being made behind the scenes to try to arrive at some settlement, at some arrangement which would bring to an end what is being perpetrated in Egypt. It is too early to say that those efforts will succeed. We hope they will succeed. We hope that the

good sense that was voiced here almost unanimously two nights ago will prevail and that practical arrangements can be devised in the very near future to put an end to the hostilities in Egypt.

94. We notice that the representative of the United States has brought two draft resolutions before this Assembly today [A/3272, 3273]. We realize on reading these documents that the United States is concerned with the causes which have led to the present situation in Egypt. This is a commendable concern and it certainly must engage our attention. However, these draft resolutions raise important questions which will have to be studied very carefully. Therefore it seems to my delegation that all we can do at the moment is to promise the most expeditious study of these draft resolutions and then meet again as soon as we are in a position to express the views of our Government on them.

95. But what of the immediate situation? What of the fighting that is going on? In the opinion of the delegation of India and in the opinion of the delegations of almost all the Asian and African countries represented here, something must be done immediately to try to arrest the situation that exists in Egypt today. In view of this extremely urgent fact, in view of the need to stop the hostilities in Egypt, nineteen delegations in this chamber have drawn up a draft resolution, which has been handed to the Secretariat and which will be circulated in the next few minutes. With your permission, I shall now read this brief draft resolution so that the delegations here assembled might see how acceptable it is and thus find themselves in a position speedily to support it, and thus intensify the efforts which this Assembly initiated two nights ago to stop the fighting in Egypt. This resolution reads as follows:³

"The General Assembly,

"Noting with regret that not all the parties concerned have yet agreed to comply with the provisions of its resolution of 2 November 1956,

"Noting the special priority given in the resolution to an immediate cease-fire and as part thereof to the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area,

"Noting further that the resolution urged the parties to the armistice agreements promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighbouring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements,

"1. Reaffirms its resolution of 2 November 1956 and once again calls upon the parties immediately to comply with the provisions of the said resolution;

"2. Authorizes the Secretary-General immediately to arrange with the parties concerned for the implementation of the cease-fire and the halting of the movement of military forces and arms into the area and requests him to report compliance forthwith and, in any case, not later than twelve hours from the time of adoption of this resolution;

"3. Requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and the members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, to obtain compliance of the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines;

"4. Decides to meet again on receipt of the Secretary-General's report referred to in operative paragraph 2 of this resolution."

96. As all delegations here will immediately recognize, this is an interim measure. This is an attempt to make an appeal to the parties which are engaged in hostilities immediately to cease those hostilities. This authorizes the Secretary-General to let us have an urgent report on his efforts, in conjunction with the parties concerned, to put an end to hostilities and to obtain withdrawal of troops from Egypt.

97. This, surely, is the least we can do tonight. Surely, this Assembly, which passed a resolution almost unanimously, not forty-eight hours ago, wishes to adhere to the terms of that resolution, wishes to call again on the parties to comply with that resolution and wishes to draw their attention, through our words here and through those of other speakers, to the worsening of the situation in Egypt, to its repercussions on the rest of the Arab world, to its reverberations in areas outside the Middle East.

98. If the situation is allowed to continue, it will soon not be one which can be met by resolutions affecting just those parties that are now on two sides of the Suez Canal. If we allow the situation to continue, we will soon be faced with a situation which will require resolutions dealing not with a few hundred square miles of territory but with many tens of thousands of square miles of territory. It is therefore imperative that we stop this situation, arrest it at once. We therefore call again upon the parties concerned to comply with the resolution which we adopted by so large a majority, on the initiative of the United States of America, not two days ago. It cannot be the intention of the sixty-four countries which voted for that resolution to allow the situation to remain in mid-air, because there is no mid-air in a situation like this: there is a terrible fall-out from a situation of this kind, and the area of contamination and war will spread rapidly.

99. It is for these reasons that we are asking for the interim measures included in this draft resolution.

100. We give the Secretary-General only twelve hours to report to us. That is a short period of time. But, first, the situation is extremely grave; secondly, certain Powers took it upon themselves to give Egypt a twelve-hour ultimatum, and certainly, if twelve hours were given in those circumstances, twelve hours are enough to stop the situation created by the end of that ultimatum.

101. We would therefore earnestly request this Assembly, including the parties concerned, to adopt immediately the draft resolution which I have just read, and which stands in the names of Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Ethiopia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Nepal, Pakistan, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand and Yemen.

102. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): The immediate purpose of our meeting tonight is to bring about as soon as possible a cease-fire and a withdrawal of forces, in the area which we are considering, from contact and from conflict with each other. Our longer-range purpose, which has already been referred to tonight and which may ultimately, in its implications, be even more important, is to find solutions for the problems which, because we have left them unsolved over the years, have finally exploded into this fighting and conflict.

103. In regard to this longer-range purpose, important draft resolutions have been submitted this evening by the United States delegation. We value this initiative, and our delegation will give those draft resolutions the examination which their importance deserves, and will,

³ Subsequently reproduced as document A/3275.

I hope, make its own detailed comments concerning them later.

104. So far as the first and immediate purpose is concerned, a short time ago the Assembly passed, by a very large majority, a resolution which is now a recommendation of the United Nations General Assembly. And so we must ask ourselves how the United Nations can assist in securing compliance with the terms of that resolution from those who are most immediately concerned and whose compliance is essential if that resolution is to be carried out. How can we get from them the support and co-operation which is required, and how can we do this quickly?

105. The representative of India has just read to us, on behalf of a number of delegations, a very important draft resolution which deals with this matter. In operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of that text, certain specific proposals are made with a view to setting up machinery to facilitate compliance with the resolution already adopted by the Assembly. I ask myself the question whether that machinery is adequate for the complicated and difficult task which is before us. I am not in any way opposing the draft resolution we have just heard read. I appreciate its importance and the spirit in which it has been put forward. But I do suggest that the Secretary-General be given another and supplementary—not conflicting, but supplementary—responsibility: to work out at once a plan for an international force to bring about and supervise the cease-fire visualized in the Assembly resolution which has already been passed.

106. For that purpose my delegation would like to submit to the Assembly a very short draft resolution which I venture to read at this time. It is as follows:⁴

"The General Assembly,

"Bearing in mind the urgent necessity of facilitating compliance with the resolution of 2 November 1956,

"Requests, as a matter of priority, the Secretary-General to submit to it within forty-eight hours, a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned, of an emergency international United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution."

107. I would assume that during this short period the Secretary-General would get into touch with the parties immediately concerned, and endeavour to secure their co-operation in the carrying out of the earlier resolution—their co-operation, I venture to repeat, is essential—as well as endeavour to secure help and co-operation from any others whom he thinks might assist him in his vitally important task.

108. The draft resolution which I have just read out and which will be circulated shortly has an added purpose of facilitating and making effective compliance with the resolution which we have already passed on the part of those whose compliance is absolutely essential. It has also the purpose of providing for international supervision of that compliance through the United Nations, and, finally, it has as its purpose the bringing to an end of the fighting and bloodshed at once, even while the Secretary-General is examining this question and reporting back in forty-eight hours.

109. If this draft resolution commended itself to the General Assembly—and I suggest that it is not in conflict with the draft resolution which has just been

read to us by the representative of India—and if it were accepted and accepted quickly, the Secretary-General could at once begin the important task which it gives him. I apologize for adding to his burdens in this way, because they have already been added to in the immediately preceding draft resolution, but we know that he can carry burdens of this kind both unselfishly and efficiently.

110. Meanwhile, during this period of forty-eight hours we can get on with our consideration of and decision on the United States draft resolutions and other draft resolutions before the General Assembly which deal with the grave and dangerous situation confronting us, both in relation to its immediate as well as its wider and perhaps even more far-reaching aspects.

111. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): With the permission of the representative of Uruguay, who is next on my list of speakers, I call on the representative of the United States.

112. Mr. LODGE (*United States of America*): Let me thank the representative of Uruguay for yielding to me for just a moment.

113. I want to say that the United States likes the Canadian draft resolution very much. We are looking for something that will meet the immediate crisis which is in front of us, as well as something that will go to the causes and into the more long-range subjects.

114. We have presented two draft resolutions dealing with the long-range questions; they obviously will require study and we are not pressing them to a vote tonight. We do think that the draft resolution submitted by the Canadian Secretary of State for External Affairs is one that should be acted on promptly, and we should like to see it given priority. We should like to see it acted on quickly this evening, because it contains a real hope of meeting the very grave emergency that confronts the world.

115. Mr. RODRIGUEZ FABREGAT (*Uruguay*) (*translated from Spanish*): A few moments ago, from this rostrum, the representative of Canada told this General Assembly that compliance with the resolution it adopted two nights ago was absolutely essential. My delegation considers that regardless of either the acceptance or the regrettable rejection of that resolution, the very fact that this Assembly is meeting indicates that the principles of the United Nations Charter remain in effect. Nothing can diminish the force of those principles, which have come to represent the deepest expression of the human conscience.

116. When the free democratic peoples of the world met at San Francisco to draw up the Charter of the United Nations and begin the work of this international Organization, they laid down in the Charter the foundations of justice and freedom and decided that armed forces should be used only in defence of States and in the common interest. On those monumental foundations the Charter became, in response to the universal appeal, what it is today, the new law of the earth.

117. Tonight we have met to consider the documents which the President has circulated to the Assembly, and to deal first and foremost with the draft resolutions submitted by the representative of the United States [A/3272, 3273].

118. I must say at the outset that, just as events are occurring so dramatically and with bewildering speed far from here, so they are occurring swiftly for us. The result is that it is somewhat difficult to take a

⁴ Subsequently reproduced as document A/3276.

definite stand, not merely on the two draft resolutions submitted today by the representative of the United States but, and even more so, on the draft resolutions presented from this rostrum a few moments ago by the representatives of India and of Canada respectively.

119. Therefore, while noting that the specific points embodied in the resolution of two days ago are still in effect, and still constitute an appeal to all the parties in this question, while affirming and hoping that the first, the fundamental, the essential and inevitable measure will be a cease-fire, the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the conflicting forces, we note, I repeat, as I said at the previous meeting, that of all these problems there is one which has its own peculiar form and characteristics, that is, the problem of the state of war between Israel and the neighbouring Arab countries, which has now reached a tragic climax.

120. We welcome the United States draft resolutions, and, in particular, the draft resolution whose purpose is to establish peace between Israel and Egypt. In our opinion it represents an immense and powerful contribution and a step forward in the attempts of the United Nations to achieve, not truces to be broken and armistices to be ignored, but a state of permanent peace between the admirable peoples and communities of that wonderful region of the world—of Israel and the Arab countries.

121. At our previous meeting I maintained that the struggle between Israel and Egypt should be considered and decided upon by the Assembly in the light of its peculiarities and of the realities of the situation. This struggle has been going on, and this situation has existed, ever since Israel's fight for independence following the adoption of United Nations resolution 181 (II), which approved the so-called partition; and it can and should be regarded in the light of this fact. In itself, it has nothing to do with other present-day conflicts, with the ultimatum sent to Egypt or with the consequent outbreak of violence which essentially gave rise to the General Assembly resolution already referred to, adopted on 2 November [997 (ES-I)].

122. As I asserted at the previous meeting, after the armistice lines were fixed between Egypt and Israel and between the Arab countries and Israel, establishing a truce between those countries and peoples, there followed, sometimes in quick succession, violations of the bases and provisions of those armistice agreements. It is an undoubted fact that during the last few years the frontier between Israel and its neighbours has been the scene of a continual struggle, a struggle which has claimed victims in the communities on both sides of the frontier. There is no point now in apportioning the blame for that struggle or in indulging in recriminations; the only appropriate course of action for the United Nations General Assembly is to face the issue and, in the name of the unanimous desire of all the peoples of the world, to lay the groundwork for a peaceful solution.

123. When from this rostrum the United States Secretary of State, introducing the draft resolution which the General Assembly adopted on 2 November, issued a warning that to continue on the path of violence would mean the destruction of the Charter and of this Organization, and when President Eisenhower spoke of peace a few days ago and we all realized that his words were a clear call for peace and a message of hope, I am sure that at that moment the silent but heartfelt gratitude of all the mothers of the world went out to him. For since the Second World War, with the establishment

of the foundations of justice in the Charter of the United Nations and the various systems and methods for resolving differences between nations, the desire of the common man in every part of the world has been for peace, not hatred, in the name of his children, in other words, in the name of hope for the future.

124. The draft resolution submitted for this purpose by the United States delegation [A/3272] makes reference, in the first place, to the Palestine Conciliation Commission set up by this Assembly under General Assembly resolution 194 (III) of 11 December 1948. It then notes the efforts made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations under the Security Council resolutions of 4 April 1956 and 4 June 1956 [S/3575, 3605]. All our fervent hopes went with the Secretary-General on that occasion, when as always he placed his great abilities at the service of this labour of peace and harmony on behalf of the Organization which appointed him.

125. The United States draft resolution then provides for the appointment of a new committee which will replace the Palestine Conciliation Commission. And here, on this point, I should like, with the President's permission, to address myself more specifically to the United States representative, so that we may reach a clear understanding of the terms of this draft resolution, with which my delegation is greatly in sympathy. The draft substitutes for the old Conciliation Commission—which Mr. Lodge very properly praised from this rostrum—a new committee, and assigns that committee the task of preparing recommendations, after consultation with the parties to the General Armistice Agreements, with a view to submitting its recommendations to the parties concerned and to the General Assembly or the Security Council.

126. I feel that it would perhaps be useful and necessary now to make this procedure more flexible. When we say that what are needed between Israel and the Arab States are not new formulae for an armistice or a truce but a formula for peace, what are we trying to say? What do we mean? To what specific principle are we referring? To what necessity and what appeal are we responding?

127. Peace negotiations, in our opinion—and this is the point of view I shall submit for consideration when we take up the draft resolution in detail—should not be pursued through intermediary procedures which may prolong the negotiations and delay solutions while the opinions of the contending parties are solicited. We must instead bring the parties together, into contact with each other. We must put the representatives of Israel, Egypt and the other Arab States together at the same council table. After all, on the one occasion when they did come together, the result of the meeting was the armistice. On the island of Rhodes in 1949, the representatives of Israel and the Arab countries met at the same table. They engaged upon a genuine discussion; they voiced their complaints, their claims, their hope and their faith. Out of that meeting the armistice agreements were born. We believe that on the present occasion we should seek a procedure which will bring the great tragic actors in this conflict into contact, so that out of their discussion may come the word of peace which both communities deserve and which the whole world is calling for.

128. My delegation would support any proposal, at any time, tending to that end, and offers its co-operation to the United States delegation, which is the sponsor of this draft resolution. We welcome this resolution

and we submit these views for consideration by the United States delegation in particular, as well as the whole Assembly.

129. We believe that the Arab peoples and the people of Israel must in the future constitute a social entity which will enable future generations to enjoy peace and progress. We know them; we have been in contact with them. We have visited the homeland of Israel, the home which Israel is fashioning day and night with its strength, and its faith, in the name of the ancient martyrs. We all know the glorious tradition of the Arab peoples; in the American continent it comes down to us from past centuries when, under the flags of Islam, Arabs and Jews in the Spanish peninsula created new ideals, new forms of culture and faith; and all this came to America in due course in Spanish ships, and was bequeathed to the peoples of America by the discoverers and those who foresaw America's present-day progress.

130. With all this in mind, I was anxious not only to support the general lines of the draft resolutions submitted by the United States delegation, but to outline our proposal concerning the draft resolution relating to the peace which must reign at long last between Israel and the Arab countries. This would be a great contribution to the progress of the world, since it would finally demonstrate that when the United Nations Charter, in the name of the martyrs of the great war of liberation against nazism, laid down the principles of solidarity and justice, it was speaking for our children, and in the sacred name of the future of the human race.

131. My delegation will examine any draft resolutions which are circulated, and reserves the right to speak later on the item under discussion.

132. Mr. CHAMANDI (Yemen): We meet again, this time with the full knowledge that the British and the French have defied the resolution adopted by an overwhelming majority of this Assembly, a resolution which, in another sense, represents the sentiments of more than 90 per cent of mankind. Two Members of this Assembly, permanent members of the Security Council, instead of responding to the manifest desires of all the peoples of the world that they put an end to their aggression, actually have intensified their savage attack upon Egypt, upon its schools, mosques, hospitals, innocent civilians and non-military institutions.

133. It is now abundantly clear to everyone that the so-called police action by the United Kingdom and France was directed against all Egypt, with a view to destroying the Egyptians and everything that Egypt has built in the last few years. Nothing could be more threatening to colonial Powers than a genuine sense of dignity and national pride among small peoples. Egypt, under President Nasser, the first truly Egyptian leader, who not only represents in sentiment the aspirations of the entire population of Egypt but who has become a symbol of Arab awakening and unity, has been the target of the British, French and Israel peoples. A blow against Egypt and against Nasser is a blow against the entire Arab world.

134. In recent years, Egypt, under the leadership of President Nasser, has been guilty of defending the legitimate and God-given rights which are embodied in our Charter, rights which are not merely for the Egyptians, but also for all those who are still experiencing a bitter struggle against France and the United Kingdom. Egypt has supported the right of self-determination of the people of Algeria and of the

people of Cyprus, and has raised its voice and given hope to all the people of Asia and Africa. Egypt is guilty of being a supporter of the freedom and equality of all nations. Therefore, Egypt must be crushed and severely punished for that support. The United Kingdom and France, still, and with little sense of shame, claiming to be the champions of freedom, having become certain that a major world war is now impossible because of the existence of the hydrogen bomb, saw the opportunity to resort to nineteenth-century gunpowder diplomacy and tactics. The Kingdom of Yemen warns the peoples of Asia and Africa of this trend in European diplomacy.

135. Mr. Dulles, to whom we wish a speedy recovery, warned us at the meeting of the Assembly on 1 November of the danger of a Power taking the law into its own hands. He said:

"If . . . we were to agree . . . that whenever a nation feels that it has been subjected to injustice it should have the right to resort to force in an attempt to correct that injustice, then I fear that we should be tearing this Charter into shreds." [561st meeting, para. 140.]

The United Kingdom and France remained heedless to this and many similar warnings from all quarters of the globe, even from their own public servants and citizens. Some of them, such as Mr. Nutting, Minister of State of the United Kingdom, have resigned in moral indignation.

136. We, the small nations, possess very little in the form of military security. Our security against the strong lies in strict adherence to the principles of the United Nations. When the so-called big Powers—for bigness seems to refer only to military strength and to world-wide prestige—take this Organization so lightly, then our basic sense of security has been destroyed. No Member among the small nations doubts that unless we all immediately take appropriate measures to guarantee the continued effectiveness of the various organs of the United Nations the security and safety of his own country will become endangered. The issue is much more than aggression against Egypt; it is an attack against the security of the weak, and a return to colonialism.

137. This Assembly should not merely punish the aggressors, but should also make certain that what has taken place in Egypt will not be repeated. Words of condemnation are not a sufficient remedy. Member States should immediately take effective steps against the United Kingdom, France and Israel if they do not cease their aggressive acts. The lesson should be unmistakably clear. Otherwise the fate of this source of security and international co-operation—I mean the United Nations—would be that of the League of Nations.

138. Everyone has now realized that aggression against Egypt was planned and synchronized by Israel, the United Kingdom and France. The representative of Israel has tried to impress upon you that the Arabs were responsible for tension in the Middle East. He even claimed that the belligerency came from the Arabs alone. The records of the Security Council and the Mixed Armistice Commissions attest to the contrary. Israel alone was condemned many times by the Security Council. It has never surprised the Arabs that Israel has been continuously belligerent to them. All of us know that the cardinal doctrine of Zionism to which Israel owes its existence is to expand the present borders of Israel to what the Zionists consider the historical Israel. Unmindful of the rights of the indigenous people of Palestine, otherwise known as the Arabs

of Palestine, which rights have been consistently recognized by the United Nations, Israel has now deemed it opportune to plot with the United Kingdom and France, its allies, this expansionist policy.

139. Peace in the Middle East has to be established on the basis of justice. The Zionists have been successful in the last forty years or so in enlisting the assistance of the big Western Powers against the people of Palestine. Now the United Kingdom and France have even conspired with Israel in attaining the goals of Zionism. In turn, Israel furnished them with the pretext for destroying Egypt.

140. We have always said that peace in the Middle East cannot be attained without justice. But now, under the circumstances, we should add that peace in the Middle East cannot be attained until some big Powers refrain from making themselves the instrument of Zionist aims. Certainly peace cannot be attained at the point of a gun. The Arabs have always proved responsive to just solutions. Unless the settlement is just, there can be no peace.

141. Mr. RIZK (Lebanon): For the third time in less than one week, the United Nations has been defied by three Member States bent on aggression, expansion and the pursuit of selfish interests. In less than one week, the civilized world has been thrice challenged, its efforts to restore peace in the Middle East thrice blocked by three power-hungry States—by Israel, a so-called State born in aggression, reared in aggression and thriving on aggression; and by two great Powers: by France, in order perhaps to find a consolation for the failure of its frustrated militarists and colonialists in their war against the brave people of Algeria, whose sole crime was that of having asserted their inalienable right to freedom and dignity, nay, to existence itself; and by the United Kingdom, which was impatient perhaps to implement its long-cherished dream of hegemony and domination over the entire Middle East, which was constantly harassed by reactionary elements in its Parliament who still dream of empire and glory and who have never forgiven their Government for having abandoned its military base in the Suez Canal, and which was determined to extinguish the flame of nationalism that is burning hot in the Arab world—that Arab world which seeks sincere co-operation with all nations, big and small, and which refuses to be the obedient slave of colonial Powers.

142. The United Nations and the civilized world were challenged by Israel when, in flagrant violation of the armistice agreements, the resolutions of the Security Council, the provisions of the Charter and the most elementary principles of decency and propriety in international conduct, it launched its unprovoked war of aggression and conquest against Egypt. The United Nations was defied when Israel contemptuously rejected the cease-fire order given to it by the Chief of Staff of the Truce Supervision Organization.

143. The United Nations and the civilized world were challenged and defied for the second time when the United Kingdom and France betrayed the confidence placed in them at San Francisco and abused their privileged position as permanent members of the Security Council to thwart the efforts of the international community in its quest for peace, nay, to be assured of a free hand in their war of conquest and domination.

144. The United Nations and the civilized world were challenged and defied for the third time in one week when the three accomplices—the United Kingdom, France and their stooge, Israel—cynically refused to

comply with the request which the General Assembly, meeting in its first emergency special session, addressed to them to cease fire immediately, to halt the movement of military forces and arms into the area, to withdraw promptly all forces behind the armistice lines and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements.

145. It has been argued in this Assembly and outside that this is not the time for propaganda speeches and that propaganda is not the way to friendship. I entirely subscribe to this view. It has also been suggested that long tirades against the aggressors—France, the United Kingdom and Israel—are not welcome at a time when minutes count in our search for means to put an end to bloodshed and destruction. With that view I have no quarrel. However, brevity must not be at the expense of truth; the facts, the true facts and not the distorted version thereof which we have heard from the representatives of France, the United Kingdom and Israel, the true facts must be brought out before we can start on the right road leading to peace. The true facts must be revealed if our efforts here are to prove fruitful and effective.

146. One fact is that Israel has committed a hideous crime of aggression against Egypt in defiance of the Security Council, the Charter and the will of humanity. It has committed this aggression in the best traditions of Israel treachery and deceit at a time when its leaders were deafening our ears with protestations of peaceful intentions, at a time when Mr. Eban, its ambassador in Washington, was calling on Secretary of State Dulles to assure him that Israel sought peace with the Arabs. It has committed this heinous crime unprovoked, the lamentations and wailings of Mr. Eban notwithstanding. The pretext given by Israel for its invasion of Egypt, namely, that it was a measure of retaliation for so-called *fedayeen* activity inside Israel, is too flimsy to deserve any comment. It has been categorically rejected by the Security Council, the Truce Supervision Organization, the Secretary-General himself and public opinion in the civilized world.

147. Another fact is that the United Kingdom and France, two great Powers, have also committed aggression against Egypt. The excuses which these two Powers give for their brutal invasion of Egypt are so grotesque that one could chuckle heartily over them but for the tragedy of the hour, and the fact that thousands of innocent lives and homes are being destroyed in Egypt by the ruthless onslaught of the invaders.

148. At the 749th meeting of the Security Council, the representative of the United Kingdom said that the objectives which his Government pursued in invading Egypt were twofold. I quote the verbatim record:

“The first consideration is that the fighting between Israel and Egypt must stop. The second consideration is that, unless hostilities can quickly be stopped, free passage through the Suez Canal will be jeopardized—that free passage on which the economic life of so many nations depends.” [S/PV.749, para. 6.]

These objectives are noble, and I am sure that no one will quarrel with them. But how did the United Kingdom and French Governments go about attaining these praiseworthy objectives? This is how they did it.

149. As regards the first objective, namely, stopping hostilities, this is the action taken by the United Kingdom and France. They plotted with Israel, incited it to attack and gave it their blessing for its massive inva-

sion of the Sinai desert in Egypt. If there is still any doubt in the minds of any one about the veracity of this fact, a quick glance at the British and American Press of the last five days would, I am sure, be sufficient to dispel such doubts. Just read the reports of James Reston and Marguerite Higgins or listen to radio broadcasts from London, and all doubt will disappear. If indeed, as France and the United Kingdom indignantly maintain, there was no collusion between them and Israel, then one has the right to ask the following questions. First, why did the United Kingdom and France, as responsible permanent members of the Security Council, not join their ally, the United States, in taking speedy action within the Council to stop hostilities? Secondly, why did they take advantage of the fact that one of them was President of the Council to delay, by dilatory tactics, a vote on the draft resolution proposed by the United States delegation, whose object was precisely to put an end to the fighting by legal and internationally accepted methods—methods which the United Kingdom and France had solemnly pledged themselves at San Francisco to follow in the face of a serious breach of the peace? Thirdly, why did they resort to the veto to block the praiseworthy efforts of their United States ally to have adopted a resolution aiming at an immediate cease-fire? Fourthly, why did we hear from the mouths of the French and United Kingdom representatives only a mild and friendly rebuke of Israel, the aggressor, while the Security Council and the General Assembly echoed to their loud blasts against Egypt, the Arabs and the entire Moslem world? Why, we repeat, why? Because, as we said before, the British and the French were not interested in peace in the Middle East. They welcomed the opportunity provided by the Israel attack on Egypt to stab that country in the back; the facts, the irrefutable facts, prove that they indeed plotted with Israel to invade Egypt.

150. The British argument that Security Council procedure was too slow and that there exists no military arm for the Security Council does not hold water. It is given the lie by the dilatory procedures followed by the United Kingdom and French delegations to prevent, or at least retard, action by the Council. If the Security Council had not been betrayed by two of its permanent members, it would have been in a position to cope with the Israel aggression and it could have called on Member States which had the means to intervene swiftly and effectively to stop the fighting. First and foremost among those Member States would, of course, have been the United Kingdom and France.

151. Furthermore, if the United Kingdom and France were genuinely interested in stopping the fighting and if they preferred to act swiftly and not to wait for Security Council action, as they pretend, one would have expected that they would intervene against the aggressor, and not against the victim, Egypt. It is indeed a curious and novel conception of maintaining the peace by helping to knock out the victim rather than attempting to arrest and punish the aggressor. It was indeed a sad occasion to listen to the representative of the United Kingdom, a permanent member of the Security Council, which has a special responsibility in maintaining the peace. It was indeed sad, to say the least, to hear him argue before the Council, at its 751st meeting, and again before the emergency special session of the General Assembly [561st meeting], that what does and what does not constitute an act of aggression is a matter for debate.

152. That Israel has thrust its armed might into Egyptian territory, that the air forces and navies of France, the United Kingdom and Israel are pounding Egyptian cities, massacring innocent people, devastating Egyptian homes—that this tragedy should occur and that a Government should argue that it is debatable whether these acts constitute aggression, can only prove the aggressive designs of that Government.

153. As for the argument that the British-French armed invasion of Egypt is to protect the Suez Canal and ensure freedom of passage, the answer there too has been given in what I have said before. As a further refutation of this flimsy argument, one could ask this question: does anyone believe that the Suez Canal is going to remain open to shipping in the face of the brutal massacre of Egyptians? Does anyone believe that the thousands of tons of high explosives being dropped on Egyptian cities and positions bordering the Canal and on shipping in the Canal will keep the Canal open and contribute to the freedom of passage through that vital artery of international intercourse?

154. The sad truth of the matter is that freedom of passage through the Suez Canal and an immediate cessation of hostilities were far from the minds of United Kingdom and French leaders when they decided to join their accomplice, Israel, in its onslaught against Egypt. The tragedy of the matter is that the United Kingdom and France determined to crush a country in which they have found an obstacle to their imperialist aims in the Middle East, in Asia and in Africa, a country which has bravely and gloriously refused to yield to the ignominious demands of colonial Powers. The United Kingdom, along with its French ally, has stabbed the victim of aggression. The responsibility of the United Kingdom and France in this ugly affair is all the greater in view of the special responsibilities placed upon them as members of the Security Council, the organ charged with the maintenance of peace and security in the world. Their responsibility is rendered even heavier by virtue of the fact that the Charter has made of them permanent members of that Council, members endowed with special powers and privileges to enable them to discharge their duties more effectively.

155. It is true that the United Kingdom and France continue to call their war of conquest a police action. It is indeed a curious police action where the so-called policeman has joined in stabbing the victim in the back rather than remaining in the police force, the Security Council, and joining in the pursuit and punishment of the criminal; it is indeed a curious police action by a policeman turned outlaw who has turned his back on the police force and joined in aggression.

156. The smaller nations of the world are alarmed. They have every reason to be alarmed. Their alarm is justified when they witness two powerful States—States in which they had put their trust—blast the foundations of the system which was so laboriously built at San Francisco “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind”. They are alarmed because two of the permanent members which have a special responsibility in maintaining peace and security have gone astray and have embarked upon a war of aggression.

157. The world will never forget the noble stand which the President, the delegation and the people of the United States have taken in the face of aggression. President Eisenhower, in proclaiming that the United States will hasten to aid the victim of aggression who-

ever he may be, was putting into practice his high principles about human conduct. For did we not hear him tell the graduating class at Baylor University on 25 May 1956 that the test of lofty sentiment is "the readiness of individuals to cleave to principle even at the cost of narrower, more immediate gains"?

158. The human race stands in admiration before the gallant fight which the forces of freedom have waged both in the Security Council and at this emergency special session of the General Assembly against the forces of aggression and conquest. These forces—and they come from Asia, Europe, Africa, Latin America and North America—have earned the gratitude of the human race for the promptness and vigour with which they have acted to put an end to death and destruction. The fact that their efforts in the Security Council were blocked by an abuse of a right and a privileged position on the part of the United Kingdom and France, the fact that these two States along with their Israel protégé have defiantly refused to comply with the provisions of the resolution adopted by the emergency special session of the General Assembly, does not mean that Israel-British-French lawlessness is on the rampage, that nothing can be done to stop the carnage, the destruction and all the horrors of war which the aggressors have brought upon the brave people of Egypt.

159. There is still a lot that the United Nations and the civilized world can and must do. British-French colonialists may have paralysed the Security Council; they have not yet completely destroyed the United Nations. They have certainly not changed the principles of the Charter, which stand defiantly as a beacon to guide our actions in the days to come. The Charter, to which we have all acceded, has mapped out the course which we are obliged to follow. It has provided ways and means of attaining our goal. It is our earnest hope that Members will avail themselves of these means to rush to the aid of the victim of aggression, to drive out the aggressors, to save the rule of law and the world order we took such pains to elaborate at San Francisco. Fellow members, it is our sincere hope that you will stand up and be counted among those who still believe in human dignity.

160. Although we fully appreciate the spirit which has prompted the United States delegation in attempting to find a permanent solution to the problems which have plagued the Middle East for a long time, we consider that this emergency special session is not the occasion at which permanent solutions of the Palestine problem and the Suez Canal can and should be discussed. The two United States draft resolutions presented this evening would more appropriately find their place at one of the regular sessions of the General Assembly. In any case, no delegation and no Government is prepared to hold a view one way or the other with regard to these draft resolutions before undertaking a long and detailed study, as they involve far-reaching political consequences. That is why I shall not pronounce myself this evening on those two draft resolutions.

161. Mr. QUIROGA GALDO (Bolivia) (*translated from Spanish*): The aggression perpetrated by France and the United Kingdom against Egypt is a *fait accompli*, which, since yesterday, has been aggravated by the frigid, haughty indifference with which the aggressors have received the General Assembly's recommendation to cease fire and withdraw from the territory they have invaded. Hundreds of women and children have been the victims of the relentless air

bombings launched by two Christian, democratic Powers. The world emerged from the Second World War in the belief that it had eliminated for all time the possibility of any repetition of the premeditated acts of aggression which had led to the Polish and Ethiopian incidents; and now it finds itself confronted once again with an act of violence on the part of two Governments which have alienated themselves completely from public opinion in their countries precisely as a result of their senseless behaviour.

162. The time has come to shun the euphemisms which many speakers have used on this rostrum in referring to the aggression perpetrated by two Members of the United Nations with responsibility for the preservation of world peace. There is only one fitting description of this stupendous *grand guignol* performance of colonial diplomacy: deceit and retrogression. Why deceit? Because an attempt was made to convince us that Paris and London had no knowledge whatsoever of Israel's invasion of Egyptian territory, and this in spite of the fact that the land, sea and air expedition with which France and the United Kingdom expect to seize the Suez Canal again had been prepared weeks ago. Why retrogression? Simply because such acts take mankind back to the dark days of colonialist expansion by the European Powers. Nothing could be more distressing and painful than to find that the Nürnberg trials have not taught us a lesson. Today as yesterday, as on that yesterday of blood and desolation, a rain of fire is descending upon defenceless towns and villages in an attempt to restore the military and colonial order which, it was hoped, the sacrifice of millions of persons had banished from the face of the earth.

163. Let us then speak the truth bluntly. Let us face the painful facts squarely and not half-heartedly. In these darkening days there is only one way to save the peace. The civilized world must raise its voice in unison to inform the aggressors that the destruction of the United Nations is a price that mankind is not prepared to pay in order to keep Algeria for France and the Suez Canal for the United Kingdom.

164. Much has been said here concerning the causes of the aggression but not always as clearly as might have been expected. In fact, the views upheld by the aggressors cannot be reconciled with those expressed by the United Nations in the historic resolution it adopted on 2 November. For the rulers of the United Kingdom and France the blow struck against Egypt is a means of solving many problems which threaten the very stability of the political régimes now in power in those countries. At the same time, it is a desperate attempt to salvage what is left of the French and British colonial empires. Now that Morocco and Tunisia have been lost, they want to maintain the rule of one million Frenchmen over nine million Algerians, or natives, as they are contemptuously called. They want to maintain their hold on Africa south of the Sahara, where cracks have already been observed which may lead to further eruptions in the cause of freedom.

165. How many thousands or millions of soldiers, one might ask, will be needed to destroy Egypt's sovereignty when an army of 400,000 to 500,000 men, fully armed and equipped, has not been able to drown in blood the yearning for freedom of little, unarmed, Algeria. Let us be frank—is there any logic in the decision by the United Kingdom to invade Egypt when they had already been compelled, under the pressure of Egyptian guerrillas, to evacuate the Canal after over sixty years of temporary occupation, and when they had to trans-

form the little island of Cyprus into a prison and a graveyard in order to keep it?

166. Many a proposal may be made from this rostrum in an attempt to end the conflict, but none can possibly have any effect so long as the Governments of the aggressor States persist in the delusion that the problems of Algeria, French West Africa, Cyprus, the Suez Canal, etc., can be solved by the destruction of an ancient and sovereign nation. As long as these countries are still governed by the men who forced them into this bloodthirsty adventure, the United Nations has no choice but to mobilize world public opinion, particularly public opinion in France and the United Kingdom, in order to besiege and conquer the crumbling fortress of a spent colonialism.

167. Many enlightened men both in France and in the United Kingdom stand with us. Evidence of this is provided by the following quotation from Mr. Gaitskell, the head of the Labour Party in the United Kingdom. As I remember, it went something like this: "We wanted to free the Canal but have only succeeded in blocking it. We wanted to protect British lives and so far have not succeeded in saving a single one. We wanted to thwart an aggression and have perpetrated a far more serious aggression."

168. In order to help achieve our objective of stopping aggression, the delegation of Bolivia—a small, so-called under-developed country, better described perhaps as a country in the early stages of industrial development—will vote in favour of any draft resolution which expresses the views and purposes which are essential in this critical moment of history.

169. We must firmly maintain the position taken by the General Assembly when, on 2 November, it adopted by an overwhelming majority the admirable draft resolution submitted by the United States [A/3256] on the initiative of that great guardian of the peace, President Eisenhower. This General Assembly cannot retreat a single step; if it were to do so it would betray the faith placed in the United Nations by the peoples of the world, and we should have to resign ourselves to the sad fate of the League of Nations, buried by the grave-diggers of peace, law and justice.

170. Mr. EBAN (Israel): In the resolution adopted on 2 November 1956 the General Assembly urged, as a matter of priority, that all parties now involved in hostilities in the area agree to an immediate cease-fire. My Government has given priority consideration to this recommendation and it now empowers me to announce that Israel agrees to an immediate cease-fire provided a similar answer is forthcoming from Egypt. My Government has also requested me to make a general observation on other aspects of the situation which now confronts the General Assembly.

171. Egypt, by its repeated assertions over the years that a state of war exists between it and Israel, has distorted the motive and purpose of the General Armistice Agreement, which, as stated in the agreement itself five times, is the restoration of permanent peace. Egypt has used this agreement, conceived as a transition to permanent peace, as a cover for murderous attacks against the population of Israel and for a relentless siege of the country by land, sea and air. Week after week and month after month, specially trained units of the Egyptian army known as *fedayeen* have entered Israel territory for murder and sabotage. Egypt has organized and directed similar gangs in other Arab countries for action against Israel. Egypt has closed

the Gulf of Elath and the Suez Canal to Israel shipping. Egypt maintains a complete economic boycott against Israel, and by threat and intimidation presses commercial interests throughout the world to abstain from legitimate trade with Israel.

172. Moreover, in preparation for an all-out attempt to eliminate Israel by force, Egypt has concluded military alliances with Israel's neighbours. Egypt has contravened her solemn obligation under the United Nations Charter, under the Constantinople Convention of 1888, and under the Security Council's resolutions of 1 September 1951 [S/2322] and 13 October 1956 [S/3675] with reference to the Suez Canal. By this and other hostile acts, Egypt has undermined the peace and deprived the armistice agreement of all its functions. The armistice agreement has, under this policy, become a fiction to which Egypt still pays lip-service in so far as it thinks this may serve a destructive design. Thus, a return to the armistice agreement would be a return to a system which has served as a cover for the victimization, the boycott and the blockade of Israel and for a policy aimed at Israel's ultimate annihilation. Moreover, Egypt interprets that agreement in terms of belligerency.

173. Egypt having thus destroyed the armistice agreement, the Government of Israel suggests that paragraph 2 of the General Assembly resolution adopted on 2 November [997 (ES-I)] does not serve the basic purpose of the United Nations as expressed in its Charter, to maintain international peace and security, to develop friendly relations amongst nations and to achieve international co-operation in solving international problems. Moreover, Egypt interprets the armistice as a state of war, and it cannot be the function of the General Assembly to promote or to foster a system of war.

174. Accordingly, the Government of Israel feels that the only answer to this situation is the establishment of peace between Israel and Egypt by direct negotiations between the two countries, and it notifies the General Assembly that it would welcome the immediate opening of negotiations to that end, for which it is prepared forthwith to send representatives for discussions with Egypt. Israel would also welcome similar negotiations with the Governments of other Arab States.

175. The crucial question with which, in the interests of all the world's peoples, the Egyptian Government must be confronted is: does it want peace or war? Israel appeals to the United Nations to lend its entire authority to the establishment of a freely negotiated peace between the Governments and peoples of the Middle East.

176. Mr. AZIZ (Afghanistan) (*translated from French*): I come to this rostrum tonight with a feeling of deep emotion and great perplexity. As representative of the peace-loving people and Government of Afghanistan I have difficulty in understanding the bloody and unjustifiable events now taking place in the Middle East. We know what horrors an invasion involves. We know that the modern Genghis Khans armed with the infernal engines of war and massacre can inflict irreparable damage on peaceful and hard-working peoples whose only desire is to have an honourable place in the world.

177. The other evening we met in these sacred premises to discuss the unjustifiable armed attack on Egypt by Israel, the United Kingdom and France. That this was an invasion is now so clear to the whole world that no one can doubt it any longer. Besides, the vote

of sixty-four members of this Assembly was irrefutable proof of the indignation and horror felt by the entire world.

178. The resolution we adopted [997 (ES-I)] called for the withdrawal of the invaders from Egyptian soil and for an immediate cease-fire. The victim—Egypt—promptly accepted it. The others refused, and are still refusing, to let go. The law of the jungle—I choose the term advisedly—and of colonialism has ushered in a new reign of terror. The civilized world must not, and indeed cannot, accept the rule of brute force. In a world in which international law is not respected and the principles of ethics and decency lose their practical value, surely no one can feel secure.

179. The countries which are devoted to peace, international law and the principles of the Charter are watching the events in the Middle East with anguish and dread. For who can fail to feel shaken when the world becomes a jungle? One thing is sure: no one can be made to do anything by force for any length of time. That is why, as representative of a peace-loving country which has always opposed injustice and invasions, I can only appeal to the conscience and ethics of this Assembly and urge it to do its utmost to put an end to the unprovoked massacres in Egypt and the Middle East. Today, Egypt is the victim. Who will be the victim tomorrow? The answer to that question will depend on the decisive action of this Assembly.

180. My delegation, with eighteen other delegations, has proposed a draft resolution [A/3275] the purpose of which is to fill a gap in the recommendation adopted two days ago. This new draft resolution gives the Secretary-General the power to arrange a cease-fire. That is why my delegation will vote for it, and we urge the Assembly to adopt it unanimously. Thousands of innocent lives can be saved by our action. Let us act quickly.

181. As regards the draft resolutions proposed by the United States delegation [A/3272, 3273], we are unable to take a position until we have consulted our Government. At this solemn moment, I wish to express the deep sympathy and the fraternal feelings of the Afghans for the Egyptians.

182. Mr. SOBOLEV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (translated from Russian): At its 562nd meeting, the General Assembly adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution designed to restore peace and tranquillity in the Near East. Since that time, however, the situation has not improved; on the contrary, it has deteriorated further. The Governments of France and the United Kingdom rejected the recommendations of the General Assembly, which offered the possibility of a settlement in the Near and Middle East. They declared that they would continue their military operations against the Egyptian people and State. The bombing of Egyptian territory continues. United Kingdom and French forces are preparing for a landing on Egyptian soil with a view to its occupation.

183. In carrying out this intervention, the United Kingdom and French Governments have not only refused to respect the will of our Organization but have openly defied it. In defying the General Assembly resolution, which has met with the complete approval of all the peoples of the world, including those of the United Kingdom and France, those Governments are hurling a challenge at the United Nations, at the fundamental principles of international law and at the conscience and honour of peoples. By wilfully ignoring the General Assembly resolution the Governments of the United

Kingdom and France are dealing a fatal blow at the prestige of the United Nations, and have confronted our Organization with a serious crisis. Their actions since the adoption of the General Assembly resolution have torn away the last shreds of the mask under which they were attempting to conceal their aggression against the Egyptian people.

184. It must now be clear to all that in their aggressive action against Egypt, France and the United Kingdom were not guided, as their representatives have contended here, by a desire to defend free navigation through the Suez Canal and to put an end to hostilities in the Near East and restore peace and tranquillity in the area. Before aggressive operations were begun by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt, complete freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal had been guaranteed, thanks to the efforts of the Egyptian Government. Despite all efforts at sabotage on the part of British-French elements, the Canal was working without interruption. Now, as a result of the barbarous bombing raids carried out by the United Kingdom and French air forces, the Suez Canal has been put out of action for a considerable time.

185. The people of Europe and Asia, whose economies depend to an appreciable extent on the normal functioning of the Canal, will have to pay a heavy price for this sort of protection of freedom of navigation. Indeed, the effects of the interruption in the regular operation of the Canal are already being felt by the people of the United Kingdom, where it is reported that gasoline rationing is being introduced and other restrictions are being prepared.

186. As for the statements that have been made that the action undertaken by the United Kingdom and French Governments is designed to restore peace and tranquillity in the Near and Middle East, they are sheer hypocrisy, as the events now taking place in that area clearly reveal. The United Kingdom and French air forces are carrying out constant raids on Egyptian communications, ports, town and villages, destroying the fruits of the toil and sweat of the Egyptian people and sowing death among the peaceful inhabitants, among women and children.

187. The flames of war kindled by the aggression carried out against Egypt by France, the United Kingdom and Israel are threatening to engulf the entire Near East and are jeopardizing international peace and security. In the aggressive action undertaken against Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel the other peoples of the Near and Middle East rightly see a threat to their own independence and existence as free nations. Syria, acting in accordance with its treaty of mutual defence against aggression concluded with Egypt, has placed its forces under united Syrian-Egyptian command. A state of emergency has been declared in Lebanon. A general mobilization has been proclaimed and martial law introduced in Iraq.

188. The accomplice of the United Kingdom and France in their aggression against Egypt—the Israel Government—is plotting acts of provocation against the neighbouring Arab States, as the American Press makes abundantly clear. A real danger has arisen that other countries of the Near and Middle East will be drawn into the conflict. The entire responsibility for this dangerous situation lies with the United Kingdom and French Governments, which have refused to accept the measures designed to bring about a settlement of the

situation that were recommended by resolution of this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

189. The Governments of the United Kingdom and France are attempting, by their aggression against the Egyptian people, to crush the Egyptian Republic, to seize part of its territory, and to reimpose the colonial yoke upon Egypt and the other peoples of the Near and Middle East. They are attempting by force of arms to restore their colonial domination in this part of the world. This policy of colonialist banditry is designed to crush the determination of the peoples of the East to achieve freedom and national independence.

190. The majority of the Members of the United Nations—sixty-four Members—have condemned the aggressive action undertaken by the United Kingdom, France and Israel against Egypt and have called for an immediate cease-fire and for a halt to the movement of military forces and arms into the area. The refusal of the United Kingdom and France to comply with this request of the General Assembly shows that they have not abandoned their plans for the destruction of the independent Egyptian State.

191. The General Assembly cannot permit the use of armed force against the Egyptian people. The Egyptian Government, though the victim of aggression, has accepted the General Assembly's recommendations and declared its willingness to carry them out. The fact that military operations in the area have not been halted is due solely to the refusal of the United Kingdom and France to heed the views of the sixty-four countries which voted in favour of the General Assembly resolution. In their replies [A/3268, 3269] to the General Assembly's decision for an immediate cease-fire, the United Kingdom and France have laid down a new ultimatum, the terms of which go even further than those of their original ultimatum to Egypt of 30 October. In substance, the United Kingdom and France are asking the United Nations itself to become an accomplice in their aggression against the Egyptian people. That, the saying goes, is the limit.

192. When the General Assembly adopted its resolution, many delegations commented on its inadequacy and weakness. In view of the necessity for immediate action to extinguish the flames of war, however, sixty-four delegations, including the delegation of the USSR, voted for the draft resolution. The General Assembly adopted this inadequate resolution, one which failed to give any true assessment of the aggressive action undertaken by the United Kingdom and France, and spared the prestige of the Governments of those countries in the expectation that they would comply with the demand of the peoples of the world to end their hostilities against Egypt. That adds still further to the weight of responsibility the Governments of the United Kingdom and France have taken upon themselves by rejecting the recommendation of the General Assembly and continuing to flout the principles of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

193. The United States representative has presented two draft resolutions at this meeting [A/3272, 3273]. While I do not wish to go into the substance of these resolutions at the present stage of the debate, I should like to point out that an attempt is being made to smother the main issue, the question of halting aggression, in futile debate on the general Palestine question and the problem of navigation in the Suez Canal. We are convened today to consider the fact that three States—the United Kingdom, France and Israel—having launched an aggressive attack against Egypt, have re-

fused to comply with the General Assembly resolution of 2 November designed to end the aggression. This is the question which calls for discussion and for an immediate decision. The general Palestine question can be considered in the course of the coming eleventh session. In this respect we agree with the points put forward by the Philippine representative.

194. At a time when a challenge has been hurled at the United Nations by the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, the General Assembly cannot rest content with the decision it has adopted, which the aggressors have failed to respect, and it has no right to sit idly by and watch the United Kingdom, France, and Israel deal with their victim. No one with any concern for the future of the United Nations can permit such a course, which would be incompatible with the conscience of the peoples and with the prestige and honour of our Organization. The peoples of the entire world are looking with hope to the United Nations, and counting on it to take firm measures to check the aggressors. We cannot disregard this desire of the peoples of the world.

195. The Soviet Union delegation calls upon the General Assembly, firstly, to condemn the armed attack carried out upon Egypt by the United Kingdom, France and Israel as an act of aggression incompatible with the purposes and principles of the United Nations; and secondly, to call upon the United Kingdom, France and Israel again to cease hostilities immediately and withdraw their armed forces from Egyptian territory and Egyptian territorial waters. The General Assembly should also consider other ways and means of helping to halt this aggression and prevent the crushing of Egypt.

196. As a result of the aggressive action undertaken by the United Kingdom and France the United Nations is undergoing a serious crisis. The Soviet delegation expresses its confidence that the United Nations will find the strength within itself to overcome this crisis and to restore peace and tranquillity in the Near and Middle East.

197. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): Before calling on the next speaker I take the liberty of making an appeal to those representatives who have asked to take part in the discussion. I am convinced that I express the general feeling of the Assembly when I emphasize the responsibility which devolves upon all of us at the present grave moment, and when I point out the urgency of transforming the deliberations of this Assembly into positive and rapid action. For these reasons I should like to ask the representatives to be as brief as possible in their statements. I do not wish to suggest any time limit; that I leave to the discretion of the speakers.

198. I apologize to the representative of Costa Rica, who is the next speaker, for having been obliged to make a statement at this time; I would not have been able to do so once the list of speakers had been exhausted.

199. Mr. CAÑAS (Costa Rica) (*translated from Spanish*): At the memorable meeting which this Assembly held two nights ago [562nd meeting] my country voted in favour of the resolution that was adopted, despite the fact that we felt there was an important omission, in that there was no reference whatsoever to a circumstance which ought to have been borne in mind at that time and which my delegation did have in mind, although we did not wish to raise the issue here; we voted for the resolution in spite of its failure

to mention that the country attacked had for many years represented a threat to the territorial integrity of Israel. We did not express our opinion with regard to the omission at the time because we felt, as did all other representatives assembled here, that on that night events were moving so fast that our speeches could not keep pace with them. Nevertheless, my delegation feels it ought to state that fact for the record. In undertaking the military operations which are our principal concern and the cause for our meeting, Israel violated the terms of an armistice, but it did not commit aggression. The initial aggression occurred eight years ago, and peace has still not been established.

200. It is quite possible that the United Nations bears some responsibility for the fact that peace has not yet been achieved. The State of Israel is a creature of this Organization, but for eight years the United Nations has been powerless to guarantee its right to live in peace. Despite all this, it was the duty of the United Nations to go to Egypt's aid when blood began to flow on Egyptian territory. The United Nations did go to Egypt's aid; the delegation of Costa Rica voted in favour of the decision to do so and it stands by that vote.

201. The resolution adopted on 2 November called for a cease-fire, and the Assembly now has before it draft resolutions which reaffirm the provisions of that resolution. A cease-fire, however, is not sufficient. We must strive for something more permanent, something higher. Our duty does not consist only in securing compliance with an armistice. At our 561st meeting the representative of China said that what was needed was peace, not merely an armistice. The situation calls for neither a cease-fire nor an armistice, but for peace. In fact, the situation that has existed in the Middle East during the past eight years is one that, more than any other and more rightfully so, may be called a cold war, a state of war, not actually characterized by daily battles and constant clashes, but nevertheless in law a state of war. We must put an end to that state of war.

202. We therefore view the first draft resolution proposed by the United States delegation [A/3272] with great sympathy because it is a proposal aimed at securing peace and going beyond a cease-fire and an armistice. It calls for peace. My delegation offers, as did the delegation of Uruguay a few minutes ago, its assistance in whatever move may be considered desirable to attain that objective of peace.

203. The Assembly should also, however, deal with the immediate problem of a cease-fire. For this purpose it is appropriate, desirable, and even necessary, that we should adopt the Canadian draft resolution [A/3276]. That draft and the first United States draft resolution complement each other and form an organic whole. They lay the foundations upon which the United Nations may build the structure of peace in the Middle East, so necessary to the Middle East and to the world.

204. We also have before us a second draft resolution proposed by the United States [A/3273]. My delegation sympathizes with the points of view expressed in it but wonders whether this is the proper time for such a draft resolution. The present session of the General Assembly was not convened for the purpose of dealing with the Suez question. The representatives of the United Kingdom and France have stated from this rostrum that the immediate cause of the action of their countries was Israel's action, and not the Suez situation. This Assembly was convened for the purpose of

dealing with the specific question considered by the Security Council at its 749th and 750th meetings, and not any other questions which, although relating to the same region, lie somewhat outside the terms of reference of this emergency special session.

205. I believe that, owing to the speed with which events are moving in the Middle East, we ought to give priority to draft resolutions dealing with the present emergency. The nineteen-Power draft resolution [A/3275] and the Canadian draft resolution are concerned with that emergency. I repeat, however, that the emergency should not cause us to forget the overriding interests of peace. It is of the highest importance that the United Nations should urgently guarantee—for the situation demands urgency—the territorial integrity, tranquillity and labour of the State which is the child of the United Nations, so that it may progress and work in peace. Israel needs peace, and we must give Israel peace. Because we have not been able to give it peace, Israel, as we have seen, resorted to acts of desperation. While condemning those acts, we should yet show that we understand them. We are therefore faced with a twofold situation. We must deal with the present emergency for which this meeting was called, but we also have the higher duty, the fulfilment of which we have delayed for eight years, to guarantee peace in the Middle East.

206. Mr. GUNewardene (Ceylon): According to the resolution adopted by the General Assembly in the early hours of 2 November, the Assembly should remain in emergency session pending compliance with that resolution. Today, therefore, we are met to discuss that subject—that is, whether or not there has been compliance with the resolution and, if not, how we can secure that compliance. It is not for us today to pass a verdict on the actions of the United Kingdom, France or Israel. That verdict has already been passed. The question before us is how we can get the United Kingdom, France and Israel to comply with the resolution that has already been adopted.

207. I am grateful that the representative of that great Government of Israel has come before this Assembly and stated that Israel is prepared to accept the cease-fire called for in the resolution. He did not, however, tell us that Israel was prepared to carry out the second part of the same resolution, which urges the parties to the armistice agreements: "promptly to withdraw all forces behind the armistice lines, to desist from raids across the armistice lines into neighbouring territory, and to observe scrupulously the provisions of the armistice agreements".

208. Therefore, the statement made by the representative of Israel only gives us an assurance of partial compliance with the resolution, while the representatives of the United Kingdom and France positively refuse, except on conditions. The position taken up by them is that of a person who enters property that does not belong to him and then refuses to leave until certain conditions are complied with. I cannot understand the legal or the moral basis for that position.

209. It is therefore a matter for regret that conditions are laid down, in spite of the moral judgement of the majority of the world, of sixty-four nations. The question before us is not whether it was justifiable invasion of the territory, whether it was police action or defensive action for the preservation of their own interests, because the verdict has been passed on that. The resolution states "armed forces of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are

conducting military operations against Egyptian territory". Those words "against Egyptian territory" are plain enough. That is what this Assembly accepted. If the objectives of the United Kingdom and France are against Egyptian territory, then the question of justification does not arise.

210. The only question, therefore, now before us, in view of the rejection, or, at least, in view of the conditions that are imposed on this Assembly for acceptance by the United Kingdom and France, is to decide what this august body should do in these circumstances. In other words, the attitude of the United Kingdom in that matter only forces us to the conclusion that their objective is the settlement of the Suez Canal problem. Their scheme was unacceptable to Egypt, and so many other nations were not prepared to go along with them. We are forced to the conclusion that this invasion of Egyptian territory was due to disappointment and frustration. I am not prepared to say categorically that it was meant for that purpose, but whatever the purpose may be, it is an invasion of Egyptian territory which, by the resolution we adopted, we are certainly not prepared to condone. France has taken up the same attitude; Israel is prepared for a partial compliance, and the United Kingdom and France are not prepared for even a partial compliance unless certain conditions are satisfied.

211. In those circumstances, we must now examine whether there are some ways and means by which compliance with this resolution can be secured from the United Kingdom, France and Israel. I think the draft resolutions before us give us some help in arriving at a conclusion about what we should do in these circumstances. We are truly grateful to the representative of the United States for his laudable objective in trying to secure an over-all settlement of the problem, but we do not normally think of the disposition of property when a patient is dying, is gasping for breath. Egypt is a patient gasping for breath, and we cannot ask Egypt to sign its last will before we are satisfied that Egypt is in a sound condition and able to take a reasonable course of action.

212. In the position in which Egypt is placed today, I say that our first duty is to see that Egypt is in a condition to exercise its sovereign rights. When that position has been created, then it will be time to consider how best the Suez Canal dispute should be decided and how best the Israel-Arab dispute should be disposed of. I freely grant that a solution may be found. This cannot go on for long, but at the same time the present moment certainly is not the occasion for the consideration of that problem. The problem before us is simply how we can secure a cease-fire, how we can secure a cessation of hostilities, and how we can put Egypt into a *status quo ante*. That is exactly the position in which we are placed.

213. The draft resolution introduced by the representative of India [A/3275], which Ceylon and other countries of the Asian group had the privilege and honour of co-sponsoring, gives the Secretary-General at least some time—it may be twelve hours, it may be eighteen hours, just as the Secretary-General would require—to see if something more can be achieved during that period to bring these nations to reason, at least reason as it is accepted by the rest of the world. Sometimes when people embark upon a course of action, they find it difficult to retreat, and obstinacy sometimes becomes a virtue. In the present circumstances, I think that these three nations should be guided by the weight

of world public opinion and by the moral judgement passed by this august body only the other day. The Secretary-General, who is well known for his tact, impartiality, ability and experience in handling this kind of intricate problem will perhaps find time, a little breathing space, to see whether other methods are possible.

214. I hope that this Assembly will find no difficulty in accepting the draft resolution sponsored by the nineteen countries. It merely requests the Secretary-General, with the assistance of the Chief of Staff and members of the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization, to obtain compliance with the request for the withdrawal of all forces behind the armistice lines. In other words, this Assembly would decide to give them a second chance to reconsider the position they have taken in the light of the discussions that are taking place this evening.

215. I see no difficulty in accepting at the same time the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Canada [A/3276]. One does not conflict with the other. Far from conflicting, this resolution would help the first resolution. The carrying out of the objectives of the draft resolution introduced by the Asian countries would be greatly helped by the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Canada. Therefore, I see no reason why this august Assembly should not also accept that draft resolution; in that case, there would be the machinery by which the three nations that have so far not complied with the resolution of 2 November could be compelled to comply with it. In other words, we would be creating machinery to produce the result which we are aiming at.

216. There is one remark I should like to make: I hope that this commission, this police force—I do not know how to describe it—will not include representatives from Israel or the United Kingdom or France. That goes without saying. Provided this task is undertaken by States which are not parties to the dispute, to this unfortunate situation, then I think that this august Assembly should also be able to accept the draft resolution introduced by the representative of Canada.

217. With regard to the draft resolutions introduced by the representative of the United States, for whom we have the greatest respect and regard, I think that they can wait for another day. We should first settle the point before us. We must bring peace and harmony and see that Egypt is again in a position to exercise its sovereign rights before we proceed to the next step.

218. I foresee no difficulty in achieving this objective. Israel has made an open declaration that it is prepared to observe a cease-fire. What further reason is there for the United Kingdom and France to intervene? They intervened because of hostilities on the part of Israel and Israel's intention to pounce on Egyptian territory. Israel now gives an undertaking that it will observe a cease-fire. What then is the answer of the United Kingdom and France now? If there are going to be hostilities, they must come from Israel; but Israel freely grants that it is prepared not to engage in hostilities. I ask therefore again: what then is the difficulty which prevents the United Kingdom and France from saying, "We shall declare a cease-fire"? Those are matters that I commend to you.

219. I have no doubt that the efforts of the Secretary-General will bring fruitful results, and the implementation of the draft resolution submitted by the Canadian representative will make it possible for us to see that the resolution of 2 November is complied with.

220. Mr. RIFA'I (Jordan): My delegation has seen the two draft resolutions submitted by the United States delegation at this meeting. In my delegation's view, this emergency meeting was not meant to be held to discuss the settlement of the two problems contemplated in these two draft resolutions. Our meeting should deal only with the state of emergency that was created as a result of the failure of France, the United Kingdom and Israel to comply with the General Assembly resolution of 2 November. These two draft resolutions involve a complete change of policy in respect to the Palestine question and the Suez Canal. The present emergency meeting of the General Assembly is not the place for such a new debate. In any event, my delegation must refer these two draft resolutions to my Government for consideration.

221. It was extremely dismaying to see the United Kingdom, French and Israel Governments refuse to comply with the resolution of the General Assembly. A short while ago, we heard the Israel representative declare on behalf of his Government that Israel agrees to a cease-fire provided Egypt agrees to it also. This declaration is incomplete because the General Assembly resolution of 2 November also calls for the withdrawal of armed forces behind the armistice line. Does his Government agree to that?

222. In view of this defiance and because of the universal ruling which demands an immediate cease-fire, the United Nations should not yield to the French-Israel-British challenge to its verdict. The United Nations was not established to encourage aggression, but to serve peace. More serious and dangerous for international relations and human doctrines is to subject peace to the desires of aggression, to suppress right and justice by the rule of force. If the United Nations is going to tolerate the principle of the superiority of aggression, then humanity should change the standards of life altogether. If the United Kingdom and France are given the opportunity to succeed in their policy of war, then peace and right will lose their merit in every case.

223. The immediate task of this emergency special session is to find means by which the General Assembly could honour its decision and by which we could go immediately to the aid of the victim if the aggressors continued their military operations against Egypt.

224. Egypt is suffering under the fire of merciless torture of a three-Power alliance. No human conscience would ever admit what is taking place there. What is equally horrible is the catastrophe which struck the 300,000 Arabs in the Gaza Strip by the march of Israel troops into the area. Are these people going to be condemned to death and destruction because there will be no room for them in Israel? Or are they going to be thrown out of the border areas as destitute refugees? Where can they go, and how? Is the United Nations going to add their number to their brethren, the 900,000 refugees who subsist on United Nations relief? And how and when?

225. After all, the Gaza Strip was the partial payment to Israel for its employment as a tool of aggression. In this respect, I wish to read to you a piece of news to show that the French forces have taken an active part in the Israel aggression. It is from today's issue of the New York *Daily Mirror*, and it reads as follows: "Mrs. Lorraine Suddath, formerly of 43-22 194th Street, Flushing, Queens, debarked from a plane at Idlewild and told of seeing battle-garbed French troops at Lydda Airport in Israel, on Sunday."

226. There is, I am afraid, a second payment which Israel wishes to demand. I shall read to you what the Israel Prime Minister, Mr. David Ben-Gurion, said to the Israel Parliament on 15 October of last month about this particular Israel aim. He said:

"I do not know whence came this doubtful initiative for a so-called peace settlement. Egypt still is occupying the Gaza Strip, which does not belong to it. Without any right, the Hashemite Jordan Government occupied extensive parts of Western Palestine."

There are now reports that the zero hour is approaching for an Israel attack on Jordan territory.

227. We in Jordan are aware of these Israel aggressive expansionist plans. But our homeland will not be easily usurped. We are there, and in every spot of the Arab countries, standing ready and firm. The battle of Egypt has not ended yet, and the battle of the Arabs has not yet begun. Egypt, throughout history, has repelled every invasion against its soil, and destroyed armies and empires and survived victorious. Palestine, throughout the foreign conquests and invasions that came upon it, invariably emerged as an Arab land. We shall defend our homeland to the last drop in our veins. This inspiration gives us the power not to yield to the logic of force, no matter how great the disaster and no matter how massive and cruel the aggression of Israel, France and the United Kingdom.

228. The only reason for the calling of this emergency special session was to take all measures possible under the "Uniting for peace" resolution to effect a cease-fire, in view of the failure of the Security Council to do so. A cease-fire resolution cannot be construed as a "recommendation" like any other resolution of the General Assembly which might be taken on any other matter because it is a resolution taken to meet an immediate need. There is a breach of the peace and an act of aggression that must stop immediately. It accepts no bargain. If the General Assembly scores another failure after that of the Security Council in arresting the aggression against Egypt immediately, then the fate of the United Nations Charter will be sealed.

229. My delegation feels that the draft resolution sponsored by nineteen Members, among which Jordan is numbered, and submitted to the consideration of the General Assembly, is the appropriate draft resolution for the present situation. We urge the Assembly to give it full support.

230. Mr. SUDJARWO (Indonesia): When at this emergency special session, two nights ago, we adopted in a dramatic manner and almost unanimously a resolution calling for an immediate cease-fire and for the withdrawal of the attacking forces of the United Kingdom, France and Israel from Egyptian soil, as the first immediate step for restoring peace in the Middle East, the world as a whole expected immediate compliance with the provisions of that resolution by the parties concerned. The resolution clearly stood as a moral condemnation of the acts of brutal aggression committed by three Member States against a fellow Member State of our Organization. It was felt here that it would, indeed, be intolerable to allow these acts of aggression to continue unchecked.

231. However, it is sad to note that the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel have seen fit only to ignore that resolution, which has been endorsed by practically all the peoples of the world; to ignore a resolution based on the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter, which they have

chosen to violate. They have continued their military aggression against Egypt, bringing about more destruction, more death, more hatred, more war—and all this, cynically in the name of peace. If this is the way they understand the making of peace—peace by armed aggression—then their conception of peace is obviously quite different from that envisaged in the United Nations Charter. This is tragic. What is more, by ignoring the resolution they have challenged the world moral force, which challenge, believe me, will do them no good, now or in the future. They can carry out such a policy because they have the armed might for it. They can now continue to maim and to kill, they can now continue to destroy because they possess the weapons for such acts. But I would remind them that they thus also continue to invite hatred and condemnation against what they dare commit, and this again will do them no good, now or in the future. They may be able to kill and to destroy material things, as they are doing now, but they never can kill and destroy the moral forces which have accumulated against them by these very acts of aggression and which led to the adoption of the resolution by this Assembly two nights ago.

232. They call their action a police action. My country and people, not long ago, knew only too well what this kind of "police action" really means. Some people in London and elsewhere have a strange conception of police indeed. Ironically, the London policeman himself—I mean, of course, the real policeman in London for whom I, who have lived in London, have the greatest regard, who carries out his duties unarmed and in the most gracious manner—will, I believe, be among the first to protest against the London Government's conception of police action. You cannot claim to be a policeman—recalling what the representative of the United Kingdom said the other night [*561st meeting*—with the duty to restore peace and separate the intruder in a home from the owner of the home by killing off the owner of that home. If you do, then you are either a bad—and indeed a very bad—policeman or this self-appointed policeman belongs in reality to the group of intruders. No, let us talk plain words. The present military action against Egypt is aggression, pure and simple. It has nothing to do with motives of peace. It is the selfish, narrow material interests of the United Kingdom and France, as was lucidly pointed out by the representative of Ecuador the other night [*562nd meeting*], which they attempt to impose by force, by their bombers and tanks, by guns and against the law, against the Security Council resolution of 13 October 1956 on the Suez Canal [*S/3675*] and now against the resolution of this General Assembly—and indeed against the decent conception of peace.

233. We are willing to recognize interests—the legitimate interests of all the parties. But no one, merely because he happens to possess the means for destruction, the means for killing the other party, can be allowed to take the law into his own hands. This is in essence, as I see it, the real issue—you may call it the moral issue—at this grave moment. That is the reason why this Assembly should uphold strongly the resolution it has overwhelmingly adopted, and why it should not tolerate it to be challenged and ignored in such a brutal manner. If we allow naked force employed in cold blood by two permanent members of the Security Council, in collaboration with a third Member of our world Organization, to destroy the resolution, then I believe that this Assembly, and indeed the United Nations, stands at a moment of great crisis.

234. We should take strong measures and employ all possible means at our disposal to give effect to this resolution. By the very nature of this emergency session, called under the "Uniting for peace" resolution, the "recommendations", as our resolution may be called, are endowed with a special character. This emergency special session has the competence and the powers comparable to those of the Security Council, which in fact it replaces under the special circumstances which prevail on this question; indeed the question was referred to us by the Security Council. Therefore, we can take effective measures, apply sanctions—economic sanctions and other kinds of sanctions if necessary—even go to the extent of dispatching forces to the troubled area with a view to securing the implementation of our resolution.

235. First of all, we must persist in our endeavours to check the aggression, to stop war and to restore peace in Egypt now, in a manner consistent with the sovereignty, integrity and dignity of the independent Egyptian State. Egypt has the right to demand this much from this Assembly, as a Member of our Organization. The prestige of the United Nations, the viability of our Organization has been shaken in its very foundations. We should secure the effective adherence of Member States to our resolution, and if necessary forcefully, in order to check aggression and restore peace and stability in the Middle East.

236. That is why my delegation, together with eighteen other delegations, has submitted the joint draft resolution which has been introduced by the representatives of the Philippines, India and others [*A/3275*]. This nineteen-Power draft resolution should therefore be adopted if we honestly meant to arrest the aggression when we adopted the resolution on 2 November.

237. My delegation was rather surprised to see the two draft resolutions submitted by the United States delegation [*A/3272, 3273*]. I fully share the view of the representative of the Philippines that these two draft resolutions do not meet exactly the immediate need of the present situation with which we are confronted, namely the non-compliance of the attacking parties with the resolution adopted two nights ago. These two United States draft resolutions, while dealing with two important issues which have a bearing on the present aggressive actions of the three Powers, in fact circumvent the issue for which we have gathered in this special meeting again tonight. The fact that the two United States draft resolutions, regardless of their own merits, do not even mention non-compliance and do not even express regret at the serious contempt of the General Assembly resolution is to me rather extraordinary. My delegation is therefore grateful to the representative of the United States that he will now not press his two draft resolutions to the vote at this meeting. My delegation believes that as long as the aggression is not checked, the war is not ended and the hostile forces are not withdrawn from the territory of Egypt, no favourable conditions for solutions of future problems in that area can be created.

238. As regards the draft resolution submitted by the representative of Canada [*A/3276*] I must say that it is an interesting proposal which may have its practical merits in conjunction with the nineteen-Power draft resolution, that is to say, to enforce the implementation not only of the cease-fire but also of the immediate withdrawal of the foreign forces. The Canadian draft resolution is not quite clear on this point. Pending further clarification, including the meaning of the

phrase "with the consent of the nations concerned" in setting up the plan as envisaged by the draft resolution, my delegation reserves the right to take a final stand upon it.

239. Mr. DE LA COLINA (Mexico) (*translated from Spanish*): The draft resolutions proposed by the United States representative are being studied by my delegation with the greatest care and interest, but I cannot give a final opinion until I receive instructions from my Government. Personally, I think that these drafts embody constructive features which might in the future contribute to the solution of the complex problems to which they refer. On the other hand, certain objections which have been raised on grounds of procedure seem at first glance to be well founded.

240. I fully agree with those representatives who think that a cease-fire and a withdrawal from Egyptian territory of the land, sea and air forces which have invaded it are matters of the utmost urgency. I think that the appeal made by the General Assembly to the Powers responsible for the actions censured by this august body will in practice have to be backed up by the dispatch of an international force under the United Nations flag, capable of physically separating the combatants in the Near East and composed of troops from countries acceptable to all the countries involved in the conflict. For that reason, such a force could not, in my opinion, consist of French and British units, as is suggested in sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the United Kingdom letter [A/3269], at least not in so far as the Egyptian frontier is concerned.

241. The Canadian draft resolution proposed by that country's Secretary of State for External Affairs is, on the other hand, in keeping with the views of my delegation and with the extreme urgency of the situation in the Near East. We welcome it.

242. With regard to the draft resolution proposed by the representatives of nineteen Asian and African nations, which really amounts to a reaffirmation of the recommendations adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November, my delegation will vote for it.

243. The statements made by the Governments of Egypt and Israel, to which we have listened with deep feeling tonight, arouse in us a faint hope that we are perhaps not so far from conciliatory solution as we at first feared. In the meantime I take the liberty of repeating what I said at our previous meeting: "It is the inescapable duty of the United Nations to give effect to the first of the purposes set forth in the Charter, to maintain international peace and security." [562nd meeting, para. 317.]

244. Mr. UROQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): The United Nations came into existence as an international authority in consequence of the events of the Second World War; its fundamental purpose, as has been repeated so often in this forum, is the maintenance of international peace and security. On two important occasions the United Nations has been confronted with difficult situations created by the violation of the principles set forth in the Charter: I refer to the Korean war and to the situation which constitutes the reason for this emergency session.

245. We are confronted with a situation created by three Member States, two of which are, what is more, permanent members of the Security Council and as such under a special duty to ensure the maintenance of international peace and security, since they enjoy certain privileges not enjoyed by the other Members of the United Nations.

246. It grieves us to have to recognize that, in addition to Israel, which might admittedly be said to have certain more or less justifiable or plausible reasons for making war on the Arab countries, two permanent members of the Security Council, two great Powers which have enjoyed the reputation of being representative of Western civilization, France and the United Kingdom, have joined in this military action. We listened carefully and, at the same time, with surprise, to what the representatives of the United Kingdom and France said in the Security Council and at this special session of the Assembly in order to justify, juridically rather than politically, the action which their countries have taken simultaneously with Israel. We cannot but state that we were greatly surprised that those Powers should try to justify, in the way they have done, their attack on a small country like Egypt, which is to a certain extent defenceless against aggression committed on such a scale and launched in a manner that is patently unjustified.

247. Though our legal training, like that of all Latin American countries, draws inspiration from Roman law and Roman sources, its fundamental sources are French, the enlightened jurisprudence of France, and we fail totally to understand how these civilized and cultured countries can hope to convince the world that what they are doing is something justifiable internationally under international law.

248. Two night ago this special session of the Assembly, in view of the Security Council's impotence as a result of the veto, adopted a resolution [997 (ES-I)], calling upon the three aggressor Powers, namely, Israel, France and the United Kingdom, to suspend hostilities, to withdraw their forces and to end this wrongful contest in Egypt. As we all know, the General Assembly's exhortation was not heeded but, on the contrary, defied. In other words, these three Member States of the United Nations continue to defy world public opinion, not only public opinion in the neutral countries but also public opinion in the countries actually involved in the situation. Repeated references have been heard here to the tone of the speeches made, for example, in Parliament in London. We all know how the United Kingdom action has been received and we all know the repercussion that its action has caused in the United States and in the world at large. Yet the military action, the attack, is continuing.

249. Tonight two draft resolutions have been presented to the Assembly by the United States [A/3272, 3273]; I do not think it necessary to refer to them, because the United States delegation itself has stated that it will not press for consideration of them now. In fact, from the point of view of my delegation, these drafts are irrelevant at this juncture. They are interesting and of potential usefulness; they may be used in the future for the purpose of solving the Palestine problem in general and the Suez Canal problem in particular, but, I repeat, they are irrelevant to the solution of the urgent problem for which this special session of the Assembly was convened.

250. Consequently I wish to refer only to the two drafts which, in our opinion, are relevant at this moment, at this time of the night, when the tragedy on the battlefield is continuing and the Assembly must take some form of action that may succeed. There are two draft resolutions which ought to be discussed and, if possible, adopted immediately: the nineteen-Power draft [A/3275] and the Canadian draft [A/3276]. These two draft resolutions are of primary importance

and should receive the immediate and exclusive attention of this meeting.

251. Some very brilliant speeches have been made this evening; but, if my colleagues will allow me, we would say that this is not the time for very long speeches, but for action, for adopting resolutions which can lead to some result. For this reason, my delegation takes the liberty of proposing that we should vote on these two draft resolutions without delay. My delegation does not consider them to be contradictory; on the contrary, it finds that they are complementary and that both can be adopted.

252. One delegation—I do not know whether I am mistaken in thinking that it was the United States delegation—proposed that the Canadian draft resolution should be voted on first. We would agree to that procedure, but on the condition that the other proposal should be voted on afterwards. In fact, we should prefer the nineteen-Power draft resolution to be voted on first. We find more useful elements which would contribute towards an immediate settlement of the problem in the nineteen-Power draft resolution than in the Canadian text. Accordingly, we would propose that the Assembly should vote first on the nineteen-Power draft and then on the Canadian draft.

253. In the Canadian draft resolution, we find a phrase which causes us great concern, namely, "with the consent of the nations governed". Perhaps it is due to our own legal training that we fail to understand how the States which have placed themselves beyond the pale of international law, which have violated the United Nations Charter, which are offending against the principles adopted at San Francisco, can be consulted and asked for their consent to an international police action by the United Nations.

254. We have often heard, in this Assembly and in the Security Council, the argument of some delegations—I am thinking of the French and United Kingdom delegations—that they are carrying out an international police action. It has already been said here that this is simply ironical. It is inadmissible that one or two States should claim the right to carry out an international police action when the only organ which can do this is precisely the Security Council or, if it fails to act, the General Assembly itself by virtue of the "Uniting for peace" resolution.

255. I therefore think that it is not acceptable in law, that for the purpose of the establishment of a body or force which is to carry out a police action, one should consult the parties against which this action is to be carried out. The only country which might be consulted, precisely because its territory is the scene of the warlike acts, is Egypt; but we fail to see how Israel, which has invaded Egyptian territory, and France and the United Kingdom which are co-operating in the attack, can be consulted in this matter.

256. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Australian representative has the floor on a point of order.

257. Mr. WALKER (Australia): On a point of order, I desire to inform the Assembly of the action that I am taking, arising from very important reports that have just come into my hands. I wish to read the following bulletin from Reuters, datelined Vienna, 4 November:

"Premier Imre Nagy of Hungary declared over Budapest Radio today that the Russian Army was

attacking the Hungarian capital and the Hungarians were fighting back.

"Nagy, speaking in English, announced: 'This is Imre Nagy speaking. In the early hours of this morning, Soviet troops started to attack the Hungarian capital with the apparent purpose of overthrowing the democratic Government of the Hungarian People's Republic.'

"Our troops are in battle with Soviet forces,' he continued. 'The Hungarian army is in position. This is my message to the Hungarian people and the whole world.'"

258. The Security Council adjourned this afternoon with the intention of meeting again on Monday morning. Before the adjournment it was made clear from my questions and the statements of the President of the Council that the Council could be called at any time. In view of this news, I am now asking the President of the Security Council to invite the members of the Council to meet with him within half an hour in his office for a consultation regarding the next steps—and the immediate steps, I trust—to be taken by the Security Council.

259. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chair takes note of the statement made by the representative of Australia.

260. Prince WAN WAITHAYAKON (Thailand): The delegation of Thailand cordially supported the draft resolution submitted by the United States in document A/3256, which was adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November, because we consider it appropriate to the requirements of the present situation.

261. Thailand is a firm supporter of the United Nations, for it sees in this world Organization the only hope for peace and the best guarantee for the territorial integrity and independence of free nations. The United Nations must not in any way be frustrated in its task of maintaining international peace and security. Hence the "Uniting for peace" resolution, which now finds its appropriate application in the present case. My delegation whole-heartedly supported the convening of this emergency special session of the General Assembly.

262. Because this is an emergency special session, however, it cannot be expected to settle the deep-rooted conflict between Israel and Egypt or to settle the thorny problem of the Suez Canal but it should overcome the emergency so tragically created by the invasion of Egypt by Israel and the so-called police action by France and the United Kingdom against Egypt, acts unwarranted under the Charter of the United Nations. Egypt, the victim of such aggressive acts, must be saved from further armed attack. Conditions of peace should, therefore, be restored forthwith, so that peaceful solutions may be further pursued.

263. Thus, there are two problems before the General Assembly: one, the immediate problem of measures to be taken forthwith for the restoration of international peace; the other, the definitive problem of settling the deep-rooted conflict between Israel and the Arab States and settling the thorny problem of the Suez Canal.

264. With regard to the first problem, inasmuch as only an incomplete response has so far been received from the parties concerned, my delegation shares the view of the other co-sponsors of the draft resolution contained in document A/3275 that the General Assembly should reaffirm its resolution of 2 November 1956 so that an immediate cease-fire may be brought

about. In supporting such reaffirmation, my delegation is desirous of making a pressing appeal to the United Kingdom, France and Israel in the interests of international peace.

265. When once conditions of peace have been restored, the atmosphere will be favourable for a real search for definitive and peaceful solutions. This, however, does not mean that the search should not be started now, because it is not likely that final solutions will be rapidly forthcoming. Committees of study entrusted with the task of submitting recommendations could be set up. This, in the opinion of my delegation, applies to the draft resolution submitted by the United States in document A/3272.

266. With regard to the United States draft resolution contained in document A/3273, however, it would appear that the committee on the Suez Canal problem would be vested with greater powers than those of recommendation, and my delegation would therefore need further time to consider it.

267. The delegation of Thailand supports the Canadian draft resolution [A/3276] as a constructive proposal to implement the cease fire.

268. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The representative of Denmark has the floor on a point of order.

269. Mr. ESKELUND (Denmark): We have had a very comprehensive discussion on the two draft resolutions which are most immediate, that is, the Canadian and the nineteen-Power drafts. Since time is going fast, and matters are very urgent, may I suggest that we take a vote immediately on those two draft resolutions. I feel sure that my suggestion will have very wide support. I think there must be some possibility within the rules of procedure, not to close the debate, but to adjourn the debate until we have voted.

270. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Chair considers that rule 76 of the rules of procedure should be applied on the understanding that, after the vote, the debate will continue so that the representatives previously on the list of speakers can make their statements. I shall put the motion of the representative of Denmark to the vote without calling on two speakers in favour and two against.

That motion was adopted by 53 votes to 1, with 9 abstentions.

271. I give the floor to the representative of India on a point of order.

272. Mr. LALL (India): We have before us two draft resolutions, one submitted by nineteen countries in document A/3275, and the other the Canadian draft resolution which appears in document A/3276. These two draft resolutions are very closely interlinked, and in my personal view it does not matter which is voted on first. We have had discussions about this matter informally with various delegations, and I understand that it would assist the acceptance of both these draft resolutions if that contained in document A/3275, which would normally be voted on first under the terms of rule 93 of the rules of procedure, were voted on after the Canadian draft resolution.

273. We would be willing to agree to a vote on the Canadian draft resolution before the vote on the nineteen-Power draft resolution, provided that the vote on the latter was taken immediately after the vote on the Canadian draft resolution. We agree to this in order to expedite our proceedings and in order to get the

maximum vote in favour of both draft resolutions. It is in that spirit that we agree to this procedure.

274. While I am here, may I, with great respect to the representative of Canada, say a few things about his draft resolution, because I do not propose to come to this rostrum again tonight if I can help it. What I wish to say about the Canadian draft resolution is that we will understand the words "with the consent of the nations concerned" to mean with the consent of the nations which will contribute to an emergency international United Nations force. It will be the understanding of the delegation of India that countries which are engaged in hostilities will not be members of the emergency force.

275. We also understand the words "cessation of hostilities" to be governed by two phrases in this draft resolution. One is in the preamble, which speaks of "compliance with the resolution of 2 November 1956", and the second is the last phrase of this draft resolution, "in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution". "In accordance with the terms" must mean in accordance with all the terms of the aforementioned resolution, and we would be grateful if the representative of Canada would kindly introduce the word "all" into that phrase between the words "with" and "the terms". If that were done, it would be quite clear that the operative part—that is the supervision of the cessation of hostilities—will refer to all the contents of the resolution which we adopted on 2 November. It is on that understanding that my delegation will be prepared to vote for the Canadian draft resolution.

276. I would only add that a vote for that draft resolution at this stage does not commit us to the plan which the Secretary-General will submit to us within forty-eight hours. I am not suggesting that we will not accept the plan the Secretary-General will draw up, but I would point out that obviously we are not committed at this stage of the plan. All we are asking for and voting for is the request that the Secretary-General should submit such a plan within forty-eight hours.

277. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): There seems to be general agreement that the Canadian resolution should be put to the vote first. After that we would vote upon the draft resolutions submitted by the nineteen Powers.

278. I should like to ask the representative of Canada his opinion of the interpretation which has been placed on his draft resolution.

279. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): My delegation completely agrees that we should vote immediately upon the Canadian draft resolution but for the reasons which I set forth at the end of my brief statement just now I would request a separate vote on the phrase "with the consent of the nations concerned." I make this request because my delegation does not agree with that phrase, and wishes to vote against it. We would support the remainder of the draft resolution.

280. Mr. PEARSON (Canada): As the draft resolution standing in the name of my delegation is about to be voted on, and as some question has been raised with regard to the interpretation of two phrases in it, perhaps I might just say a word as to what we had in mind in respect of these particular words which have been mentioned.

281. In the case of the first phrase, which has been referred to by the representative of El Salvador, namely, the phrase "with the consent of the nations

concerned", our interpretation of that is exactly the same as the interpretation of the representative of India. What we had in mind was that the Secretary-General, in submitting a plan to the United Nations, should not include in that plan for an international force the name of any country without the consent of that particular country. That may seem an obvious point, but our own experience in the past has shown that it is just as well to make it quite clear, because it has happened that on armistice commissions Governments have been named at international meetings not only before they had agreed but even before they were consulted on the subject, and these words are intended to make it doubly sure that will not happen on this occasion.

282. So far as the last few words of the draft resolution are concerned—"in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution"—our interpretation again is that of the representative of India, namely, that it should read "in accordance with all the terms of the aforementioned resolution".

283. I hope that with this clarification there will be no doubt in any representative's mind as to what he is voting for.

284. Mr. URQUIA (El Salvador) (*translated from Spanish*): In view of the interpretation given by the representative of India and the explanation just provided by the representative of Canada as sponsor of the draft resolution, my delegation will not insist on a separate vote, because if we are to understand that the "nations concerned" means those which will be requested to participate in the formation of this international police force, or whatever it may be, that will try to contribute to a settlement of the problem, then there is no need for a separate vote, and we shall have no objection to supporting the draft resolution.

285. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I now put to the vote the draft resolution which has been submitted by the delegation of Canada and which is contained in document A/3276. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Canada, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Finland, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Luxembourg, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Argentina, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Cambodia.

Abstaining: Czechoslovakia, Egypt, France, Hungary, Israel, Laos, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Albania, Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic.

The draft resolution was adopted by 57 votes to none, with 19 abstentions.

286. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): The Assembly will now vote on the draft resolution

which has been submitted by nineteen Powers and which is contained in document A/3275. A vote by roll-call has been requested.

A vote was taken by roll-call.

Argentina, having been drawn by lot by the President, was called upon to vote first.

In favour: Argentina, Austria, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Byelorussian Soviet Republic, Cambodia, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mexico, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Spain, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, Albania.

Against: Australia, France, Israel, New Zealand, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

Abstaining: Belgium, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Iceland, Laos, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Union of South Africa.

The draft resolution was adopted by 59 votes to 5, with 12 abstentions.

287. The PRESIDENT (*translated from Spanish*): I call upon the representative of the United States on a point of order.

288. Mr. Lodge (United States of America): I asked to be recognized on a point of order to say that we have just received word from our legation in Budapest that Budapest is under heavy bombardment, so much so that the staff of our own legation has had to take refuge in the cellar of the building. Prior to that, I saw some of the Press dispatches, notably one from the Associated Press, which said: "Russian gangsters have betrayed us. They are opening fire on all of Budapest."

289. And I sat here and heard the remark of the representative of the Soviet Union about stopping bloodshed in Egypt. Heaven knows I want to stop bloodshed in Egypt, but I think there is a cynicism about the Soviet Union representative talking about it at the very moment when they were shedding blood in Budapest. This will horrify everybody who knows about it.

290. When I saw the first Press dispatches I immediately asked for a meeting of the Security Council, and I was very glad to learn that it will be called soon. I simply wish to say in this great General Assembly of the United Nations how much our hearts go out to the people of Hungary and with how much warmth and feeling we think of them and wish for them a happy issue out of their trials and a future of independence.

291. Sir Pierson DIXON (United Kingdom): My fellow representatives will have read and studied the communication in document A/3269 which I made to the Secretary-General this morning and which contained the response of my Government to the resolution adopted in this Assembly forty-eight hours ago. I was obliged to oppose that resolution at the time for reasons well known to the Assembly, and my Government's response to it sets out briefly but, I think, clearly the kind of action which it thinks can best meet the critical emergency of the moment and pave the way for a

settlement as soon as possible hereafter of the two most harassing and difficult problems of the Middle East.

292. I can add very little at this time to what I said in my letter this morning, and I can only say this: we believe that police action of the most urgent kind is called for, and that is why we, with the French, have stepped in. As I have said many times, we have done so on a purely temporary basis, and the sooner the United Nations can take over from us the more we shall welcome that, particularly since our action has been so much misunderstood and criticized, even by our friends.

293. I repeat that we believed that police action was absolutely necessary, and at once, and is still necessary, but we are anxious and eager that the United Nations should take over this task as soon as it can possibly be arranged. This idea is reflected in the draft resolution, which has just been adopted and which was advanced by the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada. I found the central idea in that resolution of great interest, but, as Mr. Pearson knows, my delegation did not see the text of his draft resolution before he read it out. I have not had the time to give it a full and complete study, nor have I been able to refer it to my Government. Indeed, at first sight it does seem to me that in some respects the resolution goes too far, and in others not far enough. It was for that reason that I was not able to vote for the resolution, but, equally, I was able to abstain.

294. With regard to the draft resolution submitted by the nineteen Powers, which has been just adopted, I was obliged to vote against it simply because it sets out in a more emphatic form the resolution adopted by the General Assembly forty-eight hours ago and, in our view, does not go to the root of the problem, as my Government sees it. In our view, if we followed the course of that resolution it would only lead us back to the unhappy and increasingly dangerous state of affairs that has already prevailed for far too long in that part of the world and that has caused the recent tragic outburst of violence by Israel against Egypt.

295. We have not been asked to vote tonight on the two draft resolutions submitted by the representative of the United States [A/3272, 3273]. They address themselves to what are undoubtedly the two basic problems of the area, and I think it is valuable to have this formulation of the thoughts of the Government of the United States upon them. I have merely studied them this evening, naturally with the greatest interest, and they will be carefully studied by my Government.

296. Mr. WALKER (Australia): I take this opportunity to explain the vote of the Australian delegation on the two draft resolutions on which we have just voted. The best explanation I can give of the position of my delegation is to read out to you the following statement made by the Prime Minister of Australia, Mr. Menzies, on 3 November, Mr. Menzies said:

"As I pointed out in my statement to Parliament, the action taken by the United Kingdom and France was and is police action, the only quick and practical means of separating the belligerents and protecting the Canal. Without such police action, the Israel-Egypt position might by now have become completely out of hand, with spreading consequences. If the United Nations Assembly accepts the idea of a United Nations police force on and around the Canal, and the Security Council adopts it and acts upon it, the object of protection of the Canal will have been achieved. Meanwhile it is clear that the

United Kingdom and France cannot withdraw. Police action, to be effective, must be continuous while the danger exists.

"I fear there is much confusion about the position of Egypt. That the author of the Suez Canal confiscation and the promoter of anti-British and anti-Israel activities in the Middle East should now be represented as the innocent victim of unprovoked aggression is, of course, both wrong and absurd."

Mr. Menzies concluded his statement by saying:

"We will await the concrete development of Mr. Pearson's helpful proposal for an international police force with most sympathetic interest."

297. As Australia voted against the resolution which was adopted on 2 November we could not this evening do other than vote against the resolution proposed by India and other delegations, which in its operative paragraph reaffirms that previous resolution. As regards the Canadian draft resolution, I would like to say clearly that we support, as a matter of principle, the proposal that the Secretary-General should submit as soon as possible—within forty-eight hours if possible—a plan for the setting up, with the consent of the nations concerned, of an emergency international United Nations force to secure and supervise the cessation of hostilities. We are in favour of that proposal. But as this proposal is embodied in a resolution which is directed primarily towards facilitating compliance with the resolution of two days ago, against which we voted in accordance with the views of my Government, it was not possible for me to support the Canadian resolution, and I therefore abstained.

298. Nevertheless, the Australian Government does support in principle the suggestion that the United Nations should study the establishment, as soon as possible, of an international emergency force of this kind, and it is our view that if it is practical to establish such a force, that will on the one hand remove the need for the sort of police action which has been undertaken on this occasion by the United Kingdom and France and it may make a very important contribution to the solution of the problems of the Middle East.

299. Mr. DE GUIRINGAUD (France) (*translated from French*): I shall explain the vote of my delegation briefly.

300. During our previous meeting, I explained at length, and I believe clearly, the policy of my Government in the matter with which the Assembly is now concerned. Some speakers said tonight that the French and United Kingdom Governments failed to take any account of the recommendations in the resolution adopted by the Assembly on 2 November. I wish to say that, on the contrary, my Government examined those recommendations with the greatest attention, as may be seen from its letter to the Secretary-General, the text of which is given in document A/3268.

301. The French Government, like the United Kingdom Government, considers that it is essential to halt the hostilities threatening the Suez Canal as soon as possible and to interpose between the combatants a force which will prevent the resumption of hostilities. The two Governments are of the opinion that the time has come, by taking the measures in question, to create the necessary conditions for a definitive settlement of the Israel-Arab war, which threatens the legitimate interests of so many countries.

302. The two Governments urgently request the Governments of Israel and Egypt to agree to the sta-

tioning between their armies of a United Nations force whose mission would be to keep the peace. They ask the United Nations to take the necessary steps to organize and maintain such a force until Israel and the Arab States have agreed on peace conditions and until satisfactory arrangements have been made with regard to the Suez Canal. When these agreements have been concluded, they will have to be guaranteed by the United Nations.

303. Finally, the Governments of France and the United Kingdom ask that pending the constitution of the United Nations force the Governments of Israel and Egypt should agree to the immediate stationing between their respective armed forces of small detachments of British-French troops, acting, as it were, on behalf of the United Nations.

304. The British-French military operations will be brought to an end as soon as the requests which I have stated are fulfilled.

305. Which of these requests can be said to be motivated by selfish ambition or national interest? Their acceptance would cause no prejudice to the sovereignty of any State. The parties would merely place their fate in the hands of the international Organization, convinced at least that the Organization is determined to find a definitive solution for the problems which have occasioned their sufferings. The Governments of France and the United Kingdom have stated more than once and repeat today that the intervention of their joint forces in the beginning and of the United Nations forces as soon as possible is merely temporary.

306. In conclusion, I wish to say that the French Government's objective is a final settlement, and that it regards its intervention as merely a temporary stage and hopes that the United Nations will as soon as possible take over the responsibility which, owing to the urgency of the situation, my Government was obliged at first to assume, along with the United Kingdom Government.

307. These remarks should suffice to explain my vote. I could not vote for the draft resolution proposed by the nineteen Powers [A/3275] because it conflicted utterly with the purposes I have just defined. I abstained in the vote on the draft resolution proposed by the Canadian delegation [A/3276] chiefly because of its reference to the resolution adopted by this Assembly which we did not accept.

308. I would not wish to leave this rostrum without associating myself with the remarks just made by Mr. Lodge on the situation in Hungary. A few hours ago, in the Security Council [753rd meeting], I questioned the Soviet assurances and I asked whether the massed forces of the Red Army were not getting ready to stage another "Prague" coup at Budapest. I hope that events will not prove me right, and that the Hungarian patriots, with the support of the United Nations, will be able to protect their independence.

309. Mr. MALILE (Albania) (*translated from French*): The resolution adopted by the Security Council on 31 October 1956 convening an emergency special session of the General Assembly to discuss the attack on Egypt [S/3721] and the resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 2 November [997 (ES-I)] are great steps forward on the road to international peace and the strengthening of the United Nations Charter and will tend to reinforce the Organization's authority.

310. It is unfortunate that the General Assembly's decision has been rejected by the United Kingdom and

France and that those countries have failed to modify their views and to realize the importance of that decision. The action of the Governments of the United Kingdom, France and Israel in launching a military attack against Egypt must be described as a violation of the United Nations Charter. In the name of its people and its Government, the delegation of the Albanian People's Republic expresses the warmest sympathy for the Egyptian people in its sore trial and at the same time affirms its admiration for the determination of this people in its righteous struggle for the liberty and independence of its country.

311. The British and French Governments urged Israel to attack Egypt and, after a brutal ultimatum, which is inconsistent with the rules of international law, ostensibly for the purpose of freedom of navigation in the Suez Canal, started a military action against a sovereign State, a Member of the United Nations. Are the United Kingdom and France the only countries concerned with navigation in the Canal? Certainly not. This attack is nothing but a demonstration of the familiar policy of force. The representatives of the United Kingdom and France have many times uttered fine sentiments concerning the sovereignty of peoples. They have frequently stated that their Governments had no intention of intervening in the domestic affairs of other countries. Their speeches have been full of such words as liberty, equality, human dignity, non-intervention, and so forth. All these statements, however, are in flagrant contradiction with the actions of the United Kingdom and France.

312. We must put an end to this attack and make sure that the people of Egypt have the right to live in freedom on their own soil. In our time, those who try to tamper with the destinies of other peoples merit universal censure. Times have changed. It is madness to think that a people can be crushed by force. All the peoples of the world desire lasting peace on earth. It is not long since the Second World War, which brought to humanity terrible losses and incalculable ruin. The miseries and the calamities caused by that war are still vivid in men's minds. Can we allow the world to be dragged into a fresh catastrophe? The reply is clear. The peoples want no more of blood and disasters. The peoples of the whole world, and in particular the small countries, of which Albania is one, have always considered that the great Powers had the decisive role in safeguarding the peace of the world. The United Kingdom and France, which are among those Powers, have not fulfilled the hopes of the peoples. They have taken a dangerous road which may well lead to disastrous consequences.

313. At this time we are faced with a glaring violation of the United Nations Charter. In view of the dangerous situation created in the Middle East, it is the duty of the General Assembly, the supreme organ of the United Nations, to take effective steps to halt the attack against Egypt.

314. In the hope that peace would be re-established in the Middle East, the delegation of the Albanian People's Republic voted, on 2 November, for the draft resolution proposed by the United States representative [A/3256] and supported by the majority of the members of the General Assembly. I must regretfully say, however, that it is clear already that the United Kingdom and France have no respect for the authority of the United Nations. It is time to stop making speeches and to take practical measures to end the bombing of the Egyptian people. To save the peace, the General

Assembly should denounce the aggressors and obtain the withdrawal of their armed forces from Egypt.

315. My delegation voted for the nineteen-Power draft resolution which the Assembly has just adopted, in the hope that it would lead to a positive solution of the problem in the interests of the maintenance of peace in the world.

316. Mr. SAPOZHNIKOV (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic) (*translated from Russian*): The Ukrainian delegation welcomes this meeting of the emergency special session of the General Assembly convened to consider the extremely serious situation which has arisen in the Near East. The United Kingdom, France and Israel have refused to comply with the General Assembly resolution adopted at the previous meeting by an overwhelming majority, and have failed to halt their aggressive action against Egypt, which has been condemned by the peoples of the entire world. The letters sent by the permanent representatives of the United Kingdom and France in response to the General Assembly resolution indicate that both Governments maintain their stand and that regardless of consequences they will continue their military action, which they call "police action".

317. Thus, armed aggression in the Near East continues. Egyptian towns and villages are being subjected to brutal bombardment. Preparations are being made for an invasion by United Kingdom and French armed forces in the Suez Canal zone, and hour by hour we receive further news of the loss of human lives and the destruction of property.

318. The United Nations cannot pass over all these facts. We must take immediate action to give effect to the General Assembly resolution, with a view to achieving an immediate cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of foreign armed forces from Egyptian territory. The peace-loving peoples of the world demand protection for Egypt, a victim of completely unwarranted aggression; they demand a halt to the activities of the colonialists, which are incompatible with the honour and conscience of mankind.

319. The Ukrainian delegation adds its voice to those raised in emphatic protest against the criminal actions of the aggressors, and takes this opportunity to express its deep sympathy for the heroic Egyptian people, who are fighting for the freedom and independence of their country.

320. In an attempt to justify the acts of aggression committed by the British-French armed forces, the United Kingdom and French representatives have repeatedly stated that their purpose is to bring about a settlement of the conflict between Egypt and Israel and to restore peace in the Near East. They also affirm that they are acting to ensure freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal. Such assertions will not deceive anyone, for the actual result of the British-French intervention has been to broaden the theatre of hostilities and thus to prevent freedom of navigation through the Canal.

321. It is common knowledge that United Kingdom and French preparations for the attack on Egypt began long before the conflict arose between Israel and Egypt. The concentration of United Kingdom and French armed forces in the Mediterranean area, in particular in Cyprus and Malta, began several months ago. How, then, can it be asserted today that the aggressive acts carried out by the United Kingdom and France have been caused by the armed clash between Israel and

Egypt? It is perfectly obvious that Israel's attack on Egypt was used as a pretext to cover up the military seizure of the Suez Canal, and that Israel's aggression was itself inspired by those who were seeking such a pretext.

322. If the United Kingdom and France had been genuinely impelled by a desire to restore peace in the Near East in accordance with the requirements of the United Nations Charter, then they would have condemned the aggressor, when the armed conflict broke out, and would have supported the proposal for a cease-fire and the withdrawal of Israel armed forces behind the armistice lines, a proposal supported by an overwhelming majority of this Assembly. Instead, however, the United Kingdom and France struck at the victim of aggression by launching a flagrant armed attack against Egypt.

323. The aggressive actions undertaken by the United Kingdom, France and Israel in the Near East have given rise to an extremely dangerous situation. Any extension of the armed conflict could deal a fatal blow to international peace and undermine the very foundations of the United Nations, which is now facing its most serious challenge. Accordingly, the duty of the United Nations is to prevent any further spreading of the conflict and to restore peace in the Near East.

324. We hope that the nineteen-Power draft resolution adopted by the General Assembly at this meeting by an overwhelming majority will contribute to the achievement of this goal. For that reason the Ukrainian delegation voted in favour of the resolution.

325. Mr. OLIVIERI (Argentina) (*translated from Spanish*): We voted for the Canadian draft resolution and for that proposed by India and eighteen other Powers because the situation is so critical as to brook no delay. Urgent and effective measures must be adopted.

326. On 2 November, this Assembly adopted by a significant majority a draft resolution proposed by the United States in which first priority was given to a cease-fire and the withdrawal of troops. Despite that fact the conflict continues and, what is more, is growing more serious minute by minute. That being the case, the Assembly must try another approach so that a settlement may be reached in the face of this breach of the peace which has occurred.

327. My delegation is of the opinion that until peace has been restored, the action taken must be taken without delay. My delegation has always believed that the United Nations should find within itself the solution to all the problems which may arise in connexion with the maintenance of international peace and security. The creation of the United Nations Force, as proposed by Canada, will mean, or at least we hope it will mean, that a final settlement has been found for the present belligerent actions in the Middle East and that, by constituting an effective means of implementing the resolutions of this august body, the United Nations will most surely be strengthened and its prestige in the world enhanced at this truly crucial time when it seems that an attempt is being made to reimpose the reign over injustice, freedom and right.

328. Mr. VOUTOV (Bulgaria): We have been called to this first emergency special session of the United Nations General Assembly to discuss the extremely alarming situation in the Middle East created by the aggressive actions of Israel, the United Kingdom and France against Egypt.

329. After a long eleven-hour discussion, we adopted by a great majority a resolution [997 (ES-I)] by which the General Assembly appealed for a cease-fire by the belligerent parties and for the withdrawal of the invading troops on all frontiers. The resolution was not satisfactory to our delegation, as well as to many other delegations, but we voted for it so that the military operations of the three aggressors against Egypt would be stopped immediately. But unfortunately only the victim of the attack, Egypt, accepted the resolution. The aggressors refused to pay heed to the appeal of the General Assembly and continued to conduct military operations against the Egyptian people. This has once again exposed the United Kingdom, France and Israel as aggressors.

330. It is more clear now to all the people of the world that the Israel aggression has two aims. The first is to seize, with the aid of the United Kingdom and France, Egyptian territory. The second aim of Israel aggression is to help in the fulfilment of the British-French imperialist plans to seize the Suez Canal. In the pursuit of these two aims the Israel people have been placed in the disgraceful position of being cannon fodder of their own and foreign aggressive circles.

331. On the other hand, in these last three or four days the attempt of the aggressors to put on a peace-loving and noble mask has been laid bare. The British and French aggressors, against the will of the United Nations and without any right to do so whatever, declared themselves to be so-called protectors of peace, mediators between the two fighting sides, stating that they wanted, as Sir Pierson Dixon said, through a so-called police action to separate Israel from Egypt by means of a so-called temporary occupation of the Suez Canal. Is it possible that there are people in the world, including those who make this allegation, who believe this clumsy patched-up invention?

332. By their actions the United Kingdom and France aim to seize again the Suez Canal which they possessed for nearly ninety years, the Suez Canal was built by the blood and sweat of tens of thousands of Egyptians. These are the true aims of the British-French-Israel military operations. It is precisely in the name of these rapacious aims that they are today murdering the Egyptian people; they are destroying all cultural monuments; they are sinking Egyptian ships and stopping navigation along the Suez Canal, which is an important international waterway. They have increased international tension and have created the conditions for expanding and not for curbing war in that part of the world.

333. The United Kingdom and French Governments have alleged that they have invaded Egypt to prevent the spread of hostilities between Egypt and Israel. Reports, however, show that the hostilities are spreading. The military action that was being waged by Israel and Egyptian troops was far from the Suez Canal, whereas now the British-French troops have brought them to the Canal. Instead of ensuring, as they alleged, that they would free navigation along the Canal, the Canal has already been closed.

334. Despite the military operations of Israel on the Egyptian frontier during the first day of the Israel invasion, fifty to sixty ships, according to information submitted in the Security Council, used the Canal and were well serviced by the Egyptian administration. According to reports now coming from Egypt, some ships were sunk in the Canal itself.

335. Therefore, all the masked and hypocritical justification of the British-French aggressors has been completely laid bare by the events which are now taking place.

336. The Bulgarian delegation considers that by their aggressive actions, the United Kingdom, France and Israel are endangering world peace, are acting contrary to the provisions of the United Nations Charter, are hindering the United Nations in the taking of swift measures for ending the spread of the conflagration in the Near East, and are undermining the foundation of the United Nations. Indeed, the British-French actions and demonstrations are an expression of a desire to undermine the prestige and foundations of the United Nations.

337. But what is taking place here in the United Nations encourages all of us and is a warning to those who would use the old methods of intimidation. It is very encouraging here that two days ago almost seventy countries voted against the aggression. The Bulgarian delegation considers that it is still not too late to take measures to stop the conflict in the Near East by forcing the aggressors to withdraw from the territory of Egypt and to fulfil their obligations under the United Nations Charter. The Bulgarian delegation considers that all the conditions exist for the restoration of world peace. What is needed is the speedy and effective action of the United Nations.

338. In conclusion, permit me to read an excerpt from the declaration of my Government on the armed aggression against the Egyptian Republic:

"The Bulgarian people, together with all peace-loving people, express their full sympathies with the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian people who are heroically defending their country and the national independence of their homeland.

"Proceeding from its consistent policy of peace and the peaceful settlement of international questions, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria resolutely condemns the aggression against Egypt. The responsibility for all the dangerous complications and consequences stemming from this aggressive action rests entirely with the Governments which trampled upon the United Nations Charter and took the path of aggression and war.

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria insists that the United Nations and the Security Council should take all the necessary measures for the immediate cessation of hostilities and for the withdrawal of the foreign troops from Egyptian territory."

339. In accordance with this declaration, the Bulgarian delegation voted for the resolution which the General Assembly adopted on 2 November and for the resolutions which it adopted today.

340. Mr. SERRANO (Philippines): The Philippine delegation voted for the Canadian draft resolution because it is consonant with the basic position of my Government, which is that there should be immediate cessation of hostilities in that troubled area. We voted for this resolution, however, on the assumption that its logical implications are as follows: first, that the international force envisaged in the resolution will exercise its functions not only with respect to the British-French and Egyptian forces but also with respect to the hostilities between the Egyptian and Israel forces, as well as to other hostilities which may take place either in Egypt or in related territories when this body begins to

perform its functions; secondly, that this international police force will not include the forces of the combatants; and thirdly, that this police force will perform its functions of supervision in strict accordance with the terms of the resolution adopted by this Assembly on 2 November.

341. I should like to conclude with a word of deep appreciation for the attitude of the United States delegation. Even though it submitted two draft resolutions which were designed to take a constructive approach to the basic difficulties of this situation, it nevertheless gladly yielded to the Canadian draft resolution as a matter of priority and urgency. We can assure the United States delegation that at the appropriate time the Philippine delegation will give the two draft resolutions its utmost sympathetic consideration.

342. Mr. JOIA (Romania) (translated from French): This is not a time for long speeches. It is a time for facts and for action. I shall therefore be very brief.

343. What is the situation? What must we do? In my delegation's opinion, we must, first of all, note that the resolution adopted by the General Assembly sitting in emergency special session has evoked two different reactions, two different attitudes. On the one hand, the Egyptian Government tells us that it will accept the resolution of the General Assembly if the attacking armies stop their aggressive operations. On the other hand, the Governments of the United Kingdom and France inform us that they maintain their point of view. They also specify what they consider to be the essential conditions which have to be fulfilled before military operations can cease. Now, to stipulate these conditions means, in fact, to reply *non possumus* to the United Nations resolution.

344. We see before us two diametrically opposed attitudes. One party defers to the will of the United Nations General Assembly, the other meets it with a categorical refusal. The General Assembly, convened in an emergency special session, has called for an immediate cease-fire. The Egyptian Government accepts this, with only one condition, which stems from the right of self-defence—that the attackers shall cease their military operations. The Governments of France and the United Kingdom stipulate conditions which have nothing to do with the interests of international peace and security. And in meantime the war, for this is a war, continues, with growing severity, in Egyptian territory, against the Egyptian people, which invokes its rights and calls to the United Nations for help. The bombardment of cities and of the countryside continues. Human lives are lost. Railway and other installations are demolished. These are the facts.

345. As regards the question of international law and the rule of law, sixty-four Governments represented in the United Nations have declared through their votes that they are on the side of Egypt.

346. What must we do? First of all, it is proper to note that the United Nations has done itself honour and has upheld the law by adopting the resolution of 2 November. If the United Nations continues in this attitude and accepts its consequences, the aggressor will be disarmed. The Charter provides for sanctions in cases in which aggressor States flout the recommendations of the United Nations. The General Assembly should authorize the Secretary-General to communicate immediately with the belligerents and to bid them to cease fire, to withdraw their troops and to respect the will of the United Nations. The General Assembly should

without delay take note of the fact that the Governments of the two Western countries and Israel refuse to respect the resolution of the United Nations.

347. The Assembly has come to a decision. The time has come to act, and to act quickly, because human lives are in danger, because the sovereignty and independence of a Member State of our Organization have been attacked. Millions of people throughout the world look to us for a solution, and the United Nations and the principles for which it stands will be discredited if we fail to act in conformity with law and justice.

348. Since the nineteen-Power draft resolution meets, in essence, the needs of the moment, I voted for it.

349. Mr. BAROODY (Saudi Arabia): In explaining my vote, I should like to say that the situation no longer calls for speeches; it calls for action, action in accordance with the two resolutions just adopted by this Assembly, action in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

350. We were dismayed earlier this evening to see two other draft resolutions which, will all the genuine intentions behind them, if adopted, would have paralysed the provisions spelled out in the resolution approved by sixty-four Members of the United Nations in the early hours of 2 November 1956. Our suspicions about the attempts to save the face of the aggressor have been dissipated by the Canadian draft resolution, which we supported, together with the one which we co-sponsored with eighteen other Powers.

351. It is heartening that the United States has not pressed for its complex draft resolutions. It is also heartening that Mr. Lodge sensed the negative attitude manifested by the Assembly towards the dilatory tactics which those two draft resolutions might have afforded to certain Powers describing themselves as policemen directing the traffic in the Suez Canal. They are no longer needed to direct the traffic there in the guise of policemen, first, because the Canal does not need such policemen, and also because the Canal is already blocked. The services of the self-appointed policemen are no longer required, so they had better go home. And we had better go home at this early hour, hoping and praying for peace.

352. Sir Leslie MUNRO (New Zealand): My delegation welcomes the initiative of the Canadian delegation. It was with great regret that I was unable fully to support the form in which its draft resolution was put forward.

353. My delegation, for reasons which I stated at the 562nd meeting of this Assembly, was obliged to vote against the resolution which was then adopted. Clearly, we were, as a result, unable to support a text which referred to the urgent necessity for complying with that resolution, namely, the resolution which we had already voted against. Accordingly, also, we were unable to support a text which referred to the cessation of hostilities in accordance with the terms of the aforementioned resolution—namely the one which we had previously voted against.

354. Nevertheless, I am authorized to state that the New Zealand Government is prepared to support the establishment of a United Nations force, on acceptable terms, to assist in the establishment of peace and order in the Middle East. Not only that; I have been specifically authorized tonight to state that New Zealand is prepared to contribute to a force of the nature envisaged.

355. New Zealand's negative vote on the draft resolution of the nineteen Powers is, I think, self-explanatory

in terms of its opposition to the resolution adopted on 2 November.

356. Mr. ESKELUND (Denmark): Denmark has been a participant in the debates on the Suez Canal ever since they began after the nationalization of the Canal by Egypt. From the very first day, it has been the view of our Government that the Suez question must, in no circumstances, be solved by force or threat of force, and that a peaceful solution should be sought through the United Nations.

357. After military actions have been initiated, without authorization from the United Nations and in violation of its Charter, and after non-compliance with the resolution adopted by sixty-four nations on 2 November has been announced, it is more than ever true that the Suez Canal question can be solved only through and by the United Nations.

358. One more thing is true and should be said. Earlier this evening the representative of India struck a warning note. It was not, in my opinion, sufficiently strong. He said that if we did not stop this now, we should soon not be able to stop it by resolutions. I am very much afraid that the position is even worse, and that it is worsening rapidly. We may very soon, within days, if not hours, from now—and this I feel I have to say to all concerned, including every Member State of the United Nations—reach a position where this situation will be completely out of hand. War is indeed a dangerous monster, and it has of late grown more dangerous and more unmanageable. Moreover, the community of nations is indivisible, in that anything happening anywhere may at any time let loose events elsewhere. That most certainly should always be kept in mind.

359. May I add just one more consideration: even if the fire is apparently stamped out, it may still smoulder. Such fires are sometimes the most fierce.

360. Finally, I should like to express with all my heart my sympathy to the victims of aggression, whether in Hungary or in Egypt.

361. Mr. ASHA (Syria): I should like to explain the vote of my delegation with regard to the Canadian draft resolution. We understand by the words "with the consent of the nations concerned" the consent of the contributing nations, as was explained by the author of draft resolution, the Secretary of State for External Affairs of Canada. We also understand the "cessation of hostilities" to include the withdrawal of United Kingdom and French forces in the event that they have landed before or after the adoption of this draft resolution. We equally understand that the draft resolution means the withdrawal of Israel armed forces behind the armistice lines.

362. We voted in favour of this draft resolution also because of our honest desire to secure an effective and immediate halt to the aggression of France, the United Kingdom and Israel.

363. Mr. GARIN (Portugal): I should like to say just a few words to explain our vote on the Canadian draft resolution. The Portuguese delegation abstained from voting on the Canadian draft resolution because we had no time to refer it to the Portuguese Government. My delegation has, however, every reason to believe that the Portuguese Government favours the principle that is embodied in the resolution.

364. Mr. ULLRICH (Czechoslovakia): By the adoption of the resolution [997 (ES-I)] at the second meeting of the emergency special session of the General Assembly, an overwhelming majority of sixty-four

Members of the United Nations expressed the common view and fervent wish that the aggressive actions committed by Israel, the United Kingdom and France cease immediately. This resolution was received by the public opinion of the world whole-heartedly in the hope that it would be respected by those to whom the appeal was made. This hope was strengthened by the declaration of the Government of Egypt announcing the readiness of the Egyptian Government to accept the resolution and to comply with it. The greater was the indignation of world public opinion—and, I am convinced, of the majority of the delegations at this session of the General Assembly—when an announcement was received from the Governments of France and the United Kingdom that they were not ready to comply with the resolution of the General Assembly calling for an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of all the forces involved in hostilities in the area to behind the armistice lines. They insist on continuing what they call police action and what is actually a large-scale aggression against an independent State. In fact, the conditions they stipulate are of such a nature that they would frustrate the effective application of the General Assembly resolution and thus be equal to the complete rejection of the most urgent appeal by the General Assembly.

365. This attitude on the part of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France further aggravates the situation in the Middle East and calls for further immediate steps by the General Assembly that would help to restore peace in this area.

366. According to the report of the Secretary-General [A/3267] and other communications, large-scale military operations causing irreparable loss of life and property to the people of Egypt, which has fallen victim to aggression, are continued without interruption. According to a declaration made by the Commander-in-Chief of the British and French forces attacking Egypt: "Aerial bombing will continue until Egypt sees reason. Length of the operation depends on how quickly Egypt accepts our terms."

367. It is obvious from these facts that it is not a concern of the Governments of the United Kingdom and France to cease hostilities, but on the contrary to continue war actions until they achieve their main objective, that is, seizure of the Suez Canal and occupation of a large part of Egyptian territory.

368. It is most regrettable indeed that the Governments of the United Kingdom and France, using Israel as their tool, forcibly frustrated the possibility of a peaceful solution of the Suez Canal issue, for which there were all the prerequisites as agreed in the Security Council on 3 October 1956 and confirmed by the exchange of correspondence between the Secretary-General and the Foreign Minister of Egypt.

369. By condemning most emphatically the attitude and the actions of the aggressors, who disregarded the decision of the General Assembly aimed at the restoration of peace and who most seriously violate their obligations under the Charter, the Czechoslovak delegation supports steps which could help to put an end to an act of aggression against Egypt.

370. We voted in favour of the draft resolution presented by nineteen Asian and African nations, which reaffirms the resolution adopted by this Assembly on 2 November 1956 and which contains a new, urgent appeal for a cessation of the aggression and implementation of the cease-fire. We fully support the provision of paragraph 2 of the operative part, requesting the

Secretary-General to report compliance forthwith and not later than twelve hours from the time of adoption of the draft resolution. This should be our ultimatum for peace—the demand of the overwhelming majority of Members of the United Nations.

371. We abstained from voting on the Canadian draft resolution because we have serious doubts as to its possible implications and effectiveness.

372. As to the other draft resolutions presented at this meeting, the Czechoslovak delegation reserves its right to state its position at a later stage after having consulted its Government.

373. Mr. SHAHA (Nepal): I should like to explain the reasons why my delegation co-sponsored and supported the draft resolution which has now been adopted by the Assembly [A/3275].

374. Draft resolutions concerning solutions of the Suez and Palestine problems were submitted by the United States delegation. Those draft resolutions had their own merits. There is no question but that we should strive for a lasting and just peace in the Middle East—but only after a cease-fire has been effected.

375. I think that it has become abundantly clear during the course of the debate that a grave injustice has been done to Egypt in the present circumstances. Egypt's

territory has been invaded by the forces of Israel, the United Kingdom and France. Egypt is suffering death and devastation on a very wide scale. The invasion of Egyptian territory by Israel, the United Kingdom and France, on the pretext of protecting the Suez Canal and ensuring free passage through it, can be justified neither on the grounds of expediency nor on the basis of international law, morality and justice.

376. In my opinion, attempts by nations to confront the United Nations with *faits accomplis* in order to gain the objectives of diplomacy by the active use or the threat of force must be discouraged at all costs. The cause of suffering humanity in Egypt must receive the primary consideration of this Assembly. Steps must be taken to arrest the march of aggression and to secure justice for the people of Egypt. Once that has been done, we can think of a lasting solution of the Suez and Palestine problems.

377. Our heart reaches out to Egypt in sympathy in this grave hour of its suffering and trial. My delegation fervently hopes that the General Assembly support of the draft resolution it co-sponsored will bring effective help and relief to the Egyptian people in this hour of their trial.

The meeting rose on Sunday, 4 November, at 3.5 a.m.